

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1858.

ART. I.—THE EFFICACY OF BAPTISM.

THE CHILDREN OF THE CHURCH AND SEALING ORDINANCES. Art. I. Princeton Review. January, 1857.

NEGLECT OF INFANT BAPTISM. Art. IV. Princeton Review. January, 1857.

To find two articles on the subject of Baptism in one number of the Princeton Review, the leading organ of Presbyterian Theology in America, the one inquiring into the *status*, or real position of grace, held by baptized children in virtue of Baptism, and the other exposing the "great sin" that at least one-half, if not two-thirds, of the children of communicant Presbyterians remain unbaptized, is certainly significant. Considering the general silence and apparent comparative indifference to so important an aspect of the Sacrament of Baptism, the articles, as well as the works on which they are based, indicate to us the operation of some special cause. This line of discussion is not demanded by any unusual amount of opposition from those who hold theories in conflict with the Confession of Faith. There has been no formal attack made of late upon the Sacraments as administered in the Presbyterian Church. The Baptist controversy has in a great measure subsided. It is not then from without, we think, that the discussion receives its impulse. The cause must be sought elsewhere.

The Presbyterian Quarterlies, and the Theological Seminaries, generally, if not uniformly, set their faces against

high views of the Sacraments. The pulpits and the weekly periodicals take up and perpetuate the opposition; and the warfare is thus carried into every church and into all the families of the churches. The result of a long continued and general opposition is the prevalence of a new theory—a theory that does not involve simply an important modification of the old Reformed or Presbyterian doctrine concerning the Sacraments; but that rests upon a negation of them as possessing any intrinsic efficacy. The new theory is *negative*. It denies that, by means of the Sacraments themselves, the worthy recipient is made a partaker of the grace which the Sacraments represent. They are *signs*—outward forms or transactions setting forth the regeneration of the heart, the forgiveness of sins, and progressive sanctification, through the operation of the Holy Ghost. They are *seals* also. But the proper meaning of *seal* is denied of the term; or explained away to such an extent that *sign* and *seal* come to signify the same thing; at least it is difficult to say in what respect they differ essentially.* The Sacrament as a seal is not an effectual means of salvation, does not assure the recipient that he is a partaker of an inward saving grace as certainly and really as he receives the outward sign, but it confirms the promise of the forgiveness of sins through faith in Jesus Christ. The seal assures the recipient that he will be saved from sin and death through Christ, if he repent and believe. The same assurance is given by the word. In the one case it is written or spoken; in the other it is exhibited in a visible symbol. The benefits of Christ's work are applied by the operation of the Holy Ghost, who may be imparted in the Sacrament; yet the Sacrament and the Spirit have no necessary connection. The Spirit is given without reference to the Sacrament; with or without the

* Ridgley acknowledges the difficulty without hesitation: "The Sacraments are also said to seal the blessings that they signify; and accordingly they are called, not only signs, but seals. It is a difficult matter to explain, and clearly to state the difference between these two words, or to show what is contained in a seal that is not in a sign." Ridgley's Body of Divinity. Vol. IV, p. 163.

Sacrament; before or after Baptism, or the Lord's Supper, is administered. The promise given in the word is good alike for all, for the unbaptized as well as for the baptized; the one having no less reason to look for the inward saving work of the Holy Ghost on the heart than the other; for the promise is fulfilled in answer to prayer through the preaching of the Gospel to the unbaptized in the same sense in which it is to the baptized. A sacrament viewed as a *seal* is to be regarded, accordingly, as a confirmation of the promise of salvation through repentance and faith—a promise to which a person may lay claim with equal advantage, with or without, before or after, the administration of the sealing ordinance.

To this effect Ridgley says: "A seal, according to the most common acceptation of the word, imports a confirming sign. Yet we must take heed that we do not, in compliance with custom, contain more in our ideas of this word, than is agreeable to the analogy of faith: Therefore, let it be considered, that the principal method God hath taken for the confirming our faith in the benefits of Christ's redemption, is, his own truth and faithfulness, whereby the heirs of salvation *have strong consolation*, Heb. 4: 17, 18, or else the internal testimony of the Spirit of God in our hearts. The former is an objective means of confirmation, and the latter a subjective; and this the Apostle calls our *being established in Christ, and sealed, having the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts*. 2 Cor. 1: 21, 23. This is not the sense in which we are to understand the word as applied to the sacraments; since if we call them confirming seals, we intend nothing else hereby, but that God has to the promises that are given to us in his word, added these ordinances; not only to bring to mind this great doctrine, that Christ has redeemed His people by His blood; but to assure them, that they who believe in Him, shall be made partakers of this blessing; so that these ordinances are a pledge thereof to them, in which respect God has set his seal, whereby, in an objective way, he gives believers to understand, that Christ, and His benefits, are theirs." (Body of Divinity,

Vol. IV, p. 165.) According to Dr. Ridgley, the principal method by which God confirms our faith in the benefits of Christ's redemption has no connection with the Sacraments. The confirmation of faith is affected principally by the truth and faithfulness of God as set forth in the preaching of the Gospel, and by the internal work of the Spirit on the heart. The Sacraments are of far less account, and hold a lower place in the economy of redemption, than the preached word or the internal testimony of the Spirit. They are only outward pledges that God will accomplish what he promises in His word to those who repent and believe. But they are not the outward certification that Christ really conveys or makes over to the recipient in the act of Baptism or Communion the saving grace which the sign represents.

So we understand Dr. Ridgley. His view of the Sacraments is somewhat higher on the whole, we think, than that which at present obtains generally throughout the Presbyterian Church. Substantially, however, it is the same. The prevailing habit of thought repudiates the idea that the Sacraments are in themselves effectual means of salvation, or that they conduct us to the thing signified and efficaciously accomplish that which they represent.

The language of Dr. Dick expresses, we believe, the most prevalent opinion in the Presbyterian Church on the subject of the Sacraments. After quoting some of the strongest and most explicit passages on the intrinsic efficacy of Baptism, he says: "It is not to be inferred from these passages, that remission is inseparably connected with baptism any more than regeneration, so that every person to whom it is administered, is immediately delivered from a state of condemnation. The idea is unscriptural, and is adopted only by those who are grossly ignorant of the economy of grace, in which God reserves to himself a right to give or withhold spiritual blessings according to His pleasure. But we are plainly taught that it is a sign of remission, or that the application of the water to the body, is a symbol of the purification of the soul from guilt, by the atoning blood

of Christ. It holds out in figure the means by which children are delivered from original sin, and adults from both original and actual. In the ark, 'a few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water; the like figure whereunto,' says Peter, 'even baptism doth also now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.' (1 Peter 3: 21.) It is the symbol of salvation; and those to whom the blessing signified by it is imparted, shall as certainly escape the avenging wrath of God, as Noah and his family escaped the destruction of the flood." (Dick's Theology, Vol. II, Lect. 89, p. 338.) Dr. Dick's view of Baptism does not rise beyond the conception of a symbol or figure; and scarcely to the true conception even of that. For Baptism, as we interpret him, does not symbolize or exhibit a certain present spiritual blessing, but a blessing that may, or may not, be imparted through the atoning blood of Christ according to the secret counsel of God. It becomes thus an empty symbol—a symbol with which no corresponding meaning or force is objectively connected.

The natural tendencies of such low views of Baptism upon ministers and laymen—for we propose to limit our discussion to this Sacrament—have been two-fold. Those who hold the Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms in good faith, as the authoritative exponents of the Holy Scriptures, and make earnest with the doctrines and order of the Presbyterian Church, are more or less sensible of a conflict between the teachings of their Symbols and the prevailing habit of thought in regard to this Sacrament. Sympathizing with current views and yet venerating the Symbols as teaching the truth, their position is unsatisfactory and painful. Too much under the influence of the prevailing unsacramental theology to yield a hearty assent to the Confession of Faith, and too much under the moulding influence of the Confession and the Catechism to ignore their theory of the Sacraments and be borne along unresistingly on the tide of the age, they hold no definite views respecting the benefits of Baptism; they do

not know whether to regard baptized children as truly the lambs of the fold or not; whether to deal with them as the children of God, or as the children of the Devil. Unwilling or unprepared to take either horn of the dilemma, they enquire seriously: What is the *status* of a baptized child? "We have met many evangelical clergymen," says Dr. Atwater, the author of the article on *Sealing Ordinances*, "in precisely this state of mind, full believers in the divine institution of infant baptism, yet craving more light as to its precise import and efficacy, and urging us in our poor way to examine and discuss the subject. We have met with few who have reached a mode of apprehending the matter altogether satisfactory to themselves."

We may remark by the way, that we are gratified to find so free and full an acknowledgment of what we can not but believe to be the true state of the case. Yet what a sad and humiliating acknowledgment it is! Ordained ministers of the Gospel who have pursued a complete course of classical and theological preparation, and have been approved as well qualified to fill the pastoral office, do not know in what light to look upon the baptized children of the Church; do not know whether they belong to the Devil or to the Lord, whether they are in a state of condemnation or in a state of grace, whether they are in the kingdom of light or in the kingdom of darkness. These little ones are entrusted to the special care, guidance and protection of the ambassador of Christ. He is set for the express purpose of training them and nourishing them unto eternal life. They are the hope of the Church. But if he does not know what they are, how shall he be able to treat them properly? How shall he perform the duties of his office efficiently? He is a workman in the garden of the Lord. Are these little ones living plants or are they poisonous weeds? If he can not answer the question, how shall he go to work? Shall he cultivate them tenderly as possessing a life which is to be more fully unfolded, or shall he pluck them up by the roots because they are evil? The question lies at the very threshold of the pastoral office; and we ask, how can

a man take the first step intelligently and consistently who does not know what a baptized child is? What shall the husbandman do—what qualifications does he possess for his work, if when he sees young plants growing in his field he does not know whether they are *vines* or *weeds*? To be ignorant on this point is certainly as great a reproach to a minister as to have no definite views respecting the doctrine of the Trinity, or the doctrine of justification by faith.

The other natural tendency of low views of Baptism is to produce a neglect of the Sacrament; and neglect soon prepares the way for a total rejection of it. There may be few comparatively among laymen or ministers who draw legitimate inferences in a formal way from the principle, that there is no intrinsic efficacy in the Sacrament of Baptism. This, however, does not neutralize the force of the theory and hinder its natural result; for a principle works out its own proper results in practical life, whether the logical conclusion be deduced consciously from the premises or not. Though the people generally may not reason it out logically, they will come to *feel* at least, that if there be no real advantage derived to an infant from Baptism itself, it will suffer no real loss from the want of it. And they will, in consequence, not long continue to practice an empty form upon their children simply because they are taught to believe that God has commanded the observance of it. Baptists in principle, it requires but a short process of development until they become Baptists in practice. This effect will follow in the case of that class of Presbyterians who have not been thoroughly indoctrinated. The Confession of Faith, or the Catechism, has no strong hold upon them; and they cherish no strong attachment to it. Their religious character has been moulded by the theological tendencies of the age and by a corresponding style of preaching the Gospel, rather than by the patient and believing study of Presbyterian Symbols. They have, therefore, but a slight, if any, sense of conflict between the doctrines which they profess to hold and the current views with which they are imbued. There is no

restraint. Baptism is but a lifeless and powerless ceremony; and they give it up. No one sounds the alarm for years; and the Church at length wakes up to find that one-half of her children are unbaptized.

Here, then, we find the cause of the more than ordinary interest which we rejoice to see evinced in the Sacrament of Baptism. The article on *The Children of the Church and Sealing Ordinances* gives expression to the one tendency to which we have referred, as following naturally from low views of Baptism in the Presbyterian Church, and seeks to solve the problem which can not but arise in the minds of the more earnest and thoughtful. The article on the *Neglect of Infant Baptism* shows to what an alarming extent the other tendency has already been developed among the people, and institutes an inquiry into the causes of so widespread a practical apostacy from the old faith. Both articles are timely and proper; they discuss questions which it is in the highest degree consistent for a conscientious Presbyterian to ask, in an interesting manner and with ability; and they indicate the presence of a healthful under-tone of sentiment in regard to the Sacraments, in the midst of predominant unsacramental and even anti-sacramental tendencies.

It is consistent for an earnest Presbyterian to put these questions and endeavor to solve them, because the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms of the Church inculcate high views on the necessity and efficacy of both Sacraments, and especially of Baptism. This position we have thus far assumed. We shall now endeavor to make it good; and then in the light of it examine these Articles on Baptism.

In answer to the question: *What is a Sacrament?* the Larger Catechism answers as follows: "A sacrament is an holy ordinance instituted by Christ in His Church, to signify, seal, and exhibit unto those that are within the covenant of grace, the benefits of His mediation: to strengthen and increase their faith and all other graces; to oblige them to obedience: to testify and cherish their love and

communion one with another, and to distinguish them from those that are without." Q. 162.

"The parts of a sacrament are two: the one, an outward and sensible sign used according to Christ's own appointment; the other, an inward and spiritual grace thereby signified." Q. 163.

To complete this view we quote from the Confession of Faith, Chap. 27, Sec. 2. "There is in every sacrament a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified; whence it comes to pass that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other."

Rightly understood, we are willing to accept this statement as a correct definition of a *Sacrament*. The statement involves several particulars: 1. A sacrament is an ordinance instituted by Christ; 2. It consists of two parts; the one, outward and sensible, the other inward and spiritual; 3. These two parts are united in the Sacrament. It is a union of the outward and the inward, of the sign and the thing signified.

These several particulars are comprehended in one expression: A Sacrament is a *sign* and *seal* of divine grace. The outward element is both the sign and the seal. As a *sign* it represents grace—a spiritual good. As a *seal* it gives the assurance of a real and present grace. The thing signified is bound objectively to the sign. The outward element becomes a seal in being a *true* sign. Did the outward element exist by itself; were the union of the thing signified with the sign not necessary and real, but arbitrary and possible only, then the outward element would be in no sense a seal; it would not signify something present and real, but something that might or might not be present, according to circumstances. But in not signifying a reality, the outward element would lose its character also as a sign; it would simply be itself—water, or bread and wine; as for any thing spiritual, in real connection with the sign, it would be unmeaning and untrustworthy. A sign which does not represent any unseen reality to be in certain connection with it, is properly no sign at all. Thus

if we divest the outward element in a Sacrament of the character of a seal, it ceases also to possess the proper character of a sign. The two conceptions demand each other reciprocally.

What a Sacrament is as an Institution of Christ it is also in its use by those who worthily observe it; that is, the sacramental transaction signifies and seals divine grace to a proper subject of the Sacrament. The impartation of the outward element signifies the impartation of an inward grace. Under this view it is a sign. But the sacramental transaction is not an illusion of the senses. It is a real transaction. The infant is really washed with water, and the believer really eats bread and drinks wine at the table of the Lord. As a true sign, therefore, the application of the outward element represents a real communication of divine grace. As such it is a seal. The sacramental transaction assures the recipient that he participates in the inward grace as really as he participates in the outward element. It conveys and confirms what it signifies. The two, the sign and the thing signified, are united in the transaction as truly as in the institution. The sign completes itself in the seal. Were the present communication of the inward, to those for whom it is designed, not as real as the present communication of the outward, the transaction would be without any corresponding meaning. It would represent what does not take place. The outward would be certainly communicated, but the inward might as certainly be withheld. The outward would, in consequence, not be a true but a false or empty sign. If, therefore, the administration of a Sacrament be not a *sealing* transaction, if it do not make over and convey what it signifies, and the one as really as the other, it is not, strictly speaking, a sign. It is an outward ceremony, and no more—a ceremony of an unmeaning or delusive character.

It is in this sense that the Presbyterian Symbols hold a Sacrament to be both *a sign and a seal*. At least we see no evidence to believe that words are used without attaching

to them their proper meaning, The Confession of Faith says: *There is in every Sacrament a spiritual relation or sacramental union between the sign and the thing signified.* Here we have a most important truth. It is the union of the outward with the inward, of the sign with the thing signified, that constitutes a Sacrament; not either part taken by itself. The sign, the outward element, though used according to divine appointment, is not a Sacrament. An external washing with water performed in the name of the Trinity by a minister of the Gospel, if it include nothing more than what is thus accessible to the senses, is but a formal washing of the body with water; it is not Baptism. The breaking of bread, the pouring out of wine, and the distribution of bread and wine to a number of persons who eat and drink sitting or standing together around a table, if not really connected with an efficacious supernatural power, make but a lifeless ceremony; these things, existing by themselves, do not constitute the Lord's Supper. Nor, on the contrary, is the inward, the unseen and the supernatural, unconnected with an outward representative form, a Sacrament. The efficacious operation of the Holy Ghost, renewing the heart in the image of Jesus Christ, is not Baptism. The intimate communion of Christ with the believer, and the quickening of his inner life and of all his spiritual graces, do not make the Lord's Supper. The two parts of the ordinance must be united. What God has joined together objectively, we dare not rend asunder in idea. We may not separate the soul from the body, nor the body from the soul; for the body is not a man, nor is the soul a man; but the organic union of the soul and the body make a real human being. So we dare not separate an invisible supernatural grace from a visible, natural symbol; we dare not separate an inward efficacious operation of Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost from an outward transaction, in our conception of a Sacrament; but we must hold both parts as essential constituents of one concrete reality. Without either the inward or the outward, that which is called a Sacrament is no longer such really.

This fundamental truth may be viewed under two false aspects. Each one gives rise to a fundamental error; and each error is grounded in a corresponding generic method of thought. One error arises from a false view of the *connection* of the sign with the thing signified in a Sacrament. Instead of viewing the outward form and the inward grace as in real union, they are identified; the outward is transmuted into the inward; the sign disappears and is swallowed up in the thing signified; and the thing signified, the supernatural part or side of the Sacrament, becomes the whole reality. Thus arises the theory of Transubstantiation as taught, in regard to the Lord's Supper, by the Roman Catholic Church—a theory which destroys the conception of a Sacrament, because it destroys the integrity of the outward sign. It allows no proper reality to the outward element. Bread and wine are not real bread and real wine; each ceases to possess its peculiar distinctive properties; though they appear to be what they were originally, they are, nevertheless, substantially the very body and the very blood of Christ. There is thus no longer a real sign, and therefore no real Sacrament.

Transubstantiation is grounded in the Eutychean method of thinking. Eutycheanism denies that the unmixed peculiar attributes of humanity can be predicated of the person of Christ; and holds that the human is, in some sense, transmuted or absorbed into the divine nature. This theory destroys the proper conception of the incarnation; for how can Christ be truly incarnate—how can it be true that the Word was made *flesh*—, if Christ be not really and truly bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh? But what Eutycheanism is with regard to the person of Christ, that Transubstantiation is with regard to the Eucharist; both theories being fatal to the reality of the outward, visible, tangible side of a great mystery.

The other error arises from a false view of the *difference* between the sign and the thing signified. Instead of distinguishing properly between the outward and the inward, between the natural form and the supernatural grace, it

separates the two parts and holds them entirely asunder. It does violence to the necessary objective connection which exists between the thing signified and the sign; the outward transaction may be performed with or without the presence and power of the inward grace. The sign does indeed represent grace, but a grace that is mechanically associated with the sign, rather than a part of the very constitution of a Sacrament. The separation may be so wide as to be equivalent to a direct denial of any objective connection whatever between effectual grace and the sacramental transaction; and the Sacrament then resolves itself into an empty sign—a merely commemorative ordinance—a lifeless form—a dead ritual service.

This false view is grounded in the Nestorian method of thinking. Nestorianism admits the reality of the divine and the human natures of Christ; but reacting against the confusion of substance which Eutycheanism teaches, it separates the one from the other; and thus denies the organic union of the two in the person of Christ. The two natures are held together outwardly, and not inwardly; they exist side by side and merely coöperate together in the work of redemption; but they are not integral parts of one mysterious constitution pervaded by the power of one life-principle. What Nestorianism is in relation to the person of Christ, that this dualistic error is in relation to the Sacrament of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; both theories negate the internal and necessary connection between the natural and the supernatural, and thus divorce two distinct things which God has joined together in a mysterious unity.

Nestorianism possesses strong affinities for Unitarianism; and one system may in consequence easily pass over into the other. Nestorianism, divorcing the divine nature from the human, holds the human as existing separately from the divine. It is but a natural development of such a false separation, first, to subordinate the divine to the human, and then to suppress it altogether, when the human nature becomes the proper personality of Jesus Christ; and we have the Unitarian theory. So does the dualistic view of the Sacraments possess strong affini-

ties for the Socinian theory. Denying the internal and necessary connection between the thing signified and the sign, and thus divorcing the outward sacramental transaction from the inward supernatural grace which it exhibits, it is an easy transition to the denial of any real connection whatever of grace with forms or signs, and to the assumption that the visible part, or the sacramental transaction, is itself the whole Sacrament. Then we get the Socinian theory, namely, that there is no divine grace in the Sacraments; that Baptism possesses no intrinsic efficacy; and that the Lord's Supper is not a mystery, but only a most impressive memorial of the death and sufferings of Jesus Christ.

Such has been the actual process of development through which the prevailing Theology of America has passed. From a denial of grace being necessarily connected with, or really bound to, the sacramental transaction, it has passed on to the theory that the visible symbols and the orderly and reverential use of them, constitute the Sacrament. There is, therefore, no supernatural grace in the Sacrament itself. The inward is first divorced from the outward, the supernatural from the natural; then the outward is affirmed to be the whole Sacrament; and finally it is regarded as a self-evident proposition that the outward is not the inward, that the natural is not the supernatural, the visible not the invisible, that a mere external ceremony can possess no objective spiritual efficacy. Baptism can confer no grace. The Lord's Supper can communicate no spiritual nourishment to the believing communicant; for each is in itself but an empty though a solemn rite of Christian worship. The blessing derived from the rite is not communicated by the rite, but depends upon the state of heart and the spiritual exercises of the worshipper. A legitimate conclusion, we admit. But the course of reasoning is like taking a rich kernel out of a shell; calling the hollow shell a nut; and then regarding it as a grave error to attribute any nutritive properties to a nut.

This Socinian view of the Sacraments following natural-

ly from the Nestorian method of thinking, is altogether consistent upon the Unitarian principle. To deny the divine personality of Jesus Christ, and to deny the intrinsic efficacy of the Sacraments or sacramental grace, is logical. The one leads legitimately to the other. Both doctrines are integral parts of but one system. But there is no room for the rejection of sacramental grace on the Reformed or Presbyterian principle, that Christ is the second person of the Godhead. To hold the divine personality of Jesus Christ, to hold the real union of the supernatural with the natural, of the infinite with the finite, of the divine with the human, in the person of our Lord, and deny the union of the supernatural with the natural in the Sacraments, is a logical contradiction. The two views presuppose and rest in opposite methods of thinking—an opposition that sooner or later must make itself felt, and produce a corresponding effect. There is no resemblance or affinity whatever between consistent Unitarianism and consistent Presbyterianism. Differing radically on what constitutes the fundamental principle of the whole Christian system, they must by necessary consequence be mutually exclusive also on all subordinate points of doctrine. The Christian consciousness of the Presbyterian Church can not, therefore, in the nature of the case, continue for a very long period in this state of self-contradiction—holding, not confessionally, but actually, the Unitarian theory concerning the Sacraments and rejecting the Unitarian theory concerning the person of Christ. If there be freedom of thought and speech, there must be a reaction in one direction or the other: a tendency to lower views of the person of Christ, or a tendency to higher views of the Sacraments. The one legitimate tendency is at work, we are sorry to believe, throughout many portions of the Congregational Church of New England; the other, judging from various indications, we have reason to think, is awaking in some parts of the Presbyterian Church. At least we indulge the hope that the reaction, which without any doubt must come under one form or the other, will be in the right direction,

and result in restoring the teachings of the Confession of Faith on the Sacraments to their proper place in the faith and consciousness of those who, notwithstanding their present defection on this point from the creed of their fathers, still continue to hold it reverently as the authoritative exponent of the Sacred Scriptures.

As we must understand the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church, they exclude both the errors to which we have now referred. They neither transmute the sign into the nature of the thing signified, nor divorce from the sign the thing signified, and then deny its existence. But they maintain the reality of the sign, the reality of the thing signified, and the union of these two distinct things in the Sacrament; so that the names and effects of the one may properly be attributed to the other. A Sacrament is *a sign and a seal*—using both words in their true and full sense.

In accordance with this general view of a Sacrament, the nature of Baptism is defined by the Confession of Faith as follows: "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life: which sacrament is, by Christ's own appointment, to be continued in his Church until the end of the world." Chap. 23, 1.

"The outward element to be used in this sacrament is water wherewith the party is to be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, by a minister of the Gospel, lawfully called thereto." Sec. 2.

In order to apprehend clearly the full import of these statements we quote in connection with them the 163d Question of the Larger Catechism: "What are the parts of a sacrament? Answer. The parts of a sacrament are two; the one, an outward and sensible sign used according to Christ's own appointment; the other, an inward and

spiritual grace thereby signified." Taking all these statements together we can determine the theory of Baptism as taught in the Symbols of the Presbyterian Church.

There are two parts in the Sacrament of Baptism; the one, an outward and sensible sign; the other, an inward and spiritual grace. The outward part is not Baptism; nor is the inward part Baptism; but that is Baptism which includes both; and the one as really and necessarily as the other. The outward and the inward are each an essential constituent of this Sacrament; and no transaction can, therefore, be affirmed to be Baptism in which a sensible sign and a spiritual grace are not united. To call the outward sign, separately considered, the Sacrament, is plainly a misnomer; it is as serious an error as to call the external human form, divorced in thought from the living soul, a real human being.

What the "outward sign" and the "spiritual grace" consist in, we learn from the Confession* as just quoted. The outward element or sign is water applied to the person baptized, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, by a minister of the Gospel lawfully called thereto. The thing signified, or the spiritual grace,

* The Larger Catechism defines Baptism in nearly the same words as the Confession. In answer to the question: *What is Baptism?* it says:

"Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to be a sign and a seal of ingrafting into Himself, of remission of sins by His blood, and regeneration by His Spirit; of adoption and resurrection unto everlasting life: and whereby the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the visible Church, and enter into an open and professed engagement to be wholly and only the Lord's." Q. 165.

This definition is fuller and more explicit even than that given by the Thirty-Nine Articles: "Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others which be not christened, but it is also a sign of Regeneration or New-Birth, whereby as by an instrument they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sins, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; Faith is confirmed, and Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God." Art. 27. It is in the office for the administration of Baptism, as contained in the Book of Common Prayer, that the doctrine of the Episcopal Church concerning the efficacy of the Sacrament is most clearly brought out. The language of the Book of Common Prayer, however, is no less unambiguous than that of the Symbols of the Presbyterian Church.

is an ingrafting into Christ, regeneration, and remission of sins. These two things, the application of the water, and the accompanying work of the Spirit whereby the person baptized is ingrafted into Christ, are joined together in the baptismal transaction; for "there is in every sacrament a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified."

The Sacrament of Baptism has accordingly been ordained by Jesus Christ for a two-fold purpose: 1. For "the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church." But this is not the whole design of the Sacrament. It comprehends a great deal more. It is ordained "not only" for such solemn admission into the *visible* Church; but 2. It is to be unto the person baptized "a sign and seal of the covenant of grace"; that is, Baptism is ordained also for the admission of the person baptized into the *invisible* Church. This is evident from the accompanying explanation. A sign and seal "of the covenant of grace" is a sign and seal of "ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration and of remission of sins."

Here it is necessary to bear in mind the true import of the words *sign* and *seal*. Baptism is a *sign*. The outward application of water to the body represents or exhibits the inward work of the Holy Ghost upon the heart, by which the person is united to Christ, regenerated and pardoned. But the sign is not an empty, lifeless form. It does not represent something that is not done. It is a true sign. The thing signified is present, certain, and real. Hence the sign is also a *seal*. The baptismal transaction *assures* the person baptized, that the inward work of the Holy Ghost is as certain and real as the outward use of the sign. He is as certainly introduced into the covenant of grace, that is, he is as certainly ingrafted into Christ, regenerated by His Spirit, and forgiven through His blood, as he is externally washed with water. The thing signified is objectively connected and conferred with the sign, as truly and really, as the sign itself is used.

Nor is this an unusual meaning of the word *sign*; it is

the very sense in which the word is employed in all the affairs of actual life. The joining of hands in the ceremony of marriage is a sign; a sign that the parties take each other in good faith as husband and wife. So far from being a mere form, it is regarded as the outward expression of what is actually done—the assurance of sincerity and truth. If a bridegroom do not as certainly and really give the affections of his heart to his bride, as he extends to her his right hand; and if the outward transaction be not an assurance of his full determination to live with her in the state of matrimony according to the law of God; the solemn act is condemned by all the good as a profane mockery of God and men. The sign of a merchant is the outward indication of his business; but the business is as real and certain as the sign. If not, if the business is not really conducted at the time and place indicated, the sign is pronounced to be a base imposition upon the community; or if not an imposition, it cannot be regarded as being intended as a sign. Those who deny that God has connected supernatural grace with the outward baptismal transaction, or that He as really confers the thing signified as the sign is administered, do not attribute as much validity or reality to the ordinances of Christ in His Church as they do to the conventional arrangements of dealers in merchandize.

That we have rightly interpreted the definition of Baptism given by the Confession of Faith, will appear from some of the succeeding Sections. “Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized, are undoubtedly regenerated.” (Chap. 28, Sec. 5.) Three points are to be noted in this Section. It teaches that salvation without Baptism is not an impossibility; and that a person may be baptized without being regenerated and saved. Baptism is an effectual means of salvation to such only “as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God’s own will.” It is the elect, not the non-elect, who are ingrafted into Christ by the

Holy Ghost in the administration of the ordinance. But this Section affirms also by implication—the principal point to which we call attention—that grace and salvation are *inseparably annexed* unto Baptism. This is in full accordance with the statement that there is a “sacramental union between the sign and the thing signified.” The connection of grace and salvation with the ordinance is inseparable—the plain though indirect affirmation of the Confession; but the connection is not inseparable in such a sense that salvation is in all cases impossible without Baptism, or that every baptized person will undoubtedly be saved.

The language of the sixth Section is stronger still, and more direct. “The efficacy of Baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered; yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God’s own will, in his appointed time.” We will endeavor to analyze this plain and forcible statement.

1. Baptism *possesses efficacy*. The efficacy is not predicated of the repentance and faith of the party baptized, nor of the nurture and admonition in which Christian parents bring up their children, nor yet of the independent operations of the Holy Ghost, but it is predicated of Baptism itself. The efficacy is objective, or *in the Sacrament*, in other words, it is an *intrinsic* efficacy. If not intrinsic, it is *extrinsic*; for we can not associate any efficacy with the ordinance that is neither the one nor the other. But an extrinsic efficacy of Baptism is no efficacy at all. It is a power that lies outside of the ordinance—a power that is exerted by something which is distinct and different from the ordinance; and must in consequence be predicated of that by which it is exerted, and not of Baptism. There is no room, therefore, to speak of *the efficacy of Baptism*, as the Confession does, unless it be conceded that that efficacy is *intrinsic*—in the proper administration of the ordinance itself.

2. The efficacy of Baptism is *not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered*. The efficacy of the ordinance is indeed operative at the moment of time when it is administered; but not at that time exclusively. As according to an opinion of some of the Church Fathers, perpetuated for centuries in the history of the Church, Baptism availed only or chiefly for the remission of sins that were past, and not for the remission of such as were committed after the administration of the Sacrament, the Confession teaches, in opposition to such unscriptural limitation, that, beginning at the time when administered, the efficacy of Baptism extends over the whole of life and terminates in the resurrection from the dead; for it is a seal "of adoption, and resurrection unto everlasting life." (Lar. Cat. Q. 165.)

3. By the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is *offered* to such as that grace belongeth unto. Baptism bears or brings grace to those who are baptized, as that which belongs to them and is designed for their salvation.

4. The grace promised is *really exhibited*. Grace is not only borne or brought to the party baptized, but its nature and design are manifested, or set forth, in Baptism. As the application of water takes away the filth of the body, so does the grace of God, or the blood and Spirit of Christ, which is the thing signified in Baptism, cleanse the soul from the pollution of sin.

5. The grace promised is also *really conferred* by the Holy Ghost. For the adverb evidently qualifies both verbs. Grace is *really* exhibited and *really* conferred. It is both represented and actually communicated. A most unequivocal and forcible form of expression. The statement rises from the less to the greater truth, until it reaches the highest point of the climax, and brings out the intrinsic efficacy of Baptism with accumulated force. The efficacy is such that the grace promised is offered; it is at hand in the right use of the ordinance; not only offered but also exhibited; the party baptized sees in the visible transaction the nature and design of the ordinance to cleanse from sin, clearly set forth. But the grace promised is not only offered and exhibited,

but *really conferred* by the Holy Ghost; that is, the party baptized is made a partaker of the grace which is offered and exhibited. The grace promised is the thing signified; and the thing signified is an ingrafting into Christ, regeneration and remission of sins. As the grace promised is really conferred in Baptism, it follows that in the right use of this ordinance the party baptized is ingrafted into Christ, regenerated, and receives remission of sins, by the power of the Holy Ghost.

6. The grace promised is thus really conferred upon *such as that grace belongeth unto*. According to the doctrine of God's Decrees, (Chapter III,) that grace belongs to those who are predestinated and fore-ordained to everlasting life. The Sacrament of Baptism is, therefore, the ordinance in and through which the decree is operative effectually for the salvation of the elect. The elect are ingrafted into Christ, and made partakers of all His benefits, in virtue of the grace which is conferred on them in the right use of Baptism.

Such is the evident meaning of the explicit language of the Confession of Faith concerning the nature and efficacy of the sacrament of Baptism. We have endeavored to interpret its language fairly and consistently; and must regard the result as a legitimate conclusion.

We are well aware of an objection that may be raised against this conclusion on the ground of the 191st Question of the Larger Catechism. The Question is: "*How do the sacraments become effectual means of grace?*" To which the Answer is given: "The sacraments become effectual means of salvation, not by any power in themselves, or any virtue derived from the piety or intention of him by whom they are administered; but only by the working of the Holy Ghost, and the blessing of Christ by whom they are instituted." If, however, this answer is considered in connection with other portions of the Confession and the Catechism, it will appear that it can not sustain any objection which is valid.

One important point is admitted and taught, namely

that the Sacraments are *effectual means* of salvation; and that they become such by the working of the Holy Ghost and the blessing of Christ. So far the 161st Answer is in agreement with the passages already cited on the efficacy of Baptism. But it teaches also that the Sacraments become effectual means of salvation *not by any power in themselves*. The other clause referring to the intention of him who administers the Sacrament does not affect the question at issue, and may, therefore, be dismissed. The precise import of the answer depends upon the meaning of the word *Sacraments*. It may be used either in its full and proper sense, or in a restricted and improper sense.

Under the first view, the answer teaches that the Sacraments have *no power* in themselves—a position that is in direct conflict with what the Symbols inculcate in other places. They teach, as we have seen, that a Sacrament is a sign and a seal of grace; that in a Sacrament there is the *union* of two parts, of the thing signified with the sign, of the grace promised, which is an ingrafting into Christ by the Holy Ghost, with the outward representation of it; and that, therefore, in the right use of the ordinance the grace promised is *conferred* as really as the outward transaction takes place. In other words, the Symbols elsewhere strictly affirm concerning the efficacy of a Sacrament what the 161st Answer denies.

But it is not necessary to take the word in its full and proper sense. Nor have we any disposition to charge the work of the Westminster Assembly of divines, for whose learning and piety we cherish profound respect, with being self-contradictory, unless there be no other alternative. The other view, we think, is the correct one. The word *Sacraments* is used in a restricted and improper sense. It denotes, not the Sacrament as the Symbols so carefully and unequivocally define them, but merely the external element and the external transaction, separately considered, which a Sacrament, properly speaking, includes. The Answer separates the working of the Holy Ghost from the Sacrament, and then denies of the visible ceremony what it attributes

to the Holy Ghost and the blessing of Christ; whilst elsewhere the Symbols regard the thing signified, or the working of the Holy Ghost, as a constituent part of a Sacrament, disallow indirectly the application of the name even to a transaction which does not comprehend invisible grace, and consequently predicate intrinsic efficacy, or objective force, of the Sacrament itself. It is not, therefore, against the intrinsic efficacy of the Sacraments, rightly considered, but against the *opus operatum* theory of the Roman Catholic Church that this Answer is directed, according to which theory the performance of the external work itself confers grace; and it corresponds to the 72nd Question* of the Heidelberg Catechism. There is one important difference, however. Whilst the Larger Catechism denies here that there is any efficacy in the *Sacrament* itself, and thus seems to contradict what in other places it explicitly teaches; the Heidelberg Catechism denies intrinsic efficacy of the *external baptism with water*, but not of the Sacrament itself.

Whatever, now, we may think of the propriety of separating the sign from the thing signified, and then applying to the sign the name which belongs to the union of both, a method which the Scriptural idea of a Sacrament does not warrant, one thing is certain, namely, that no argument can consistently be derived from the 161st Answer against the interpretation we have given to the teaching of the Symbols concerning the efficacy of Baptism. Or, should such an argument be insisted on, it would involve the Symbols of the Presbyterian Church in a direct contradiction.

In order to establish the doctrine that grace is inseparably annexed to Baptism, and conferred upon the party baptized in the right use of the ordinance, the Confession and Catechism cite a number of passages bearing upon the subject, from the Sacred Scriptures. We will transfer several of them.

Rom. 4: 11, And he received the sign of circumcision,

* Q. 72. Is then the external baptism with water, the washing away of sin itself? Answer. Not at all; for the blood of Jesus Christ only, and the Holy Ghost, cleanses us from all sin.—*Heidelberg Catechism*.

a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised; that righteousness might be imputed to them also. Compared with Col. 2: 11, 12. In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.

Acts 2: 38. Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.

Acts 22: 16. Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins.

John 3: 5. Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God

1 Cor. 12: 13. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.

Gal. 3: 27. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.

Rom. 6: 3, 4. Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.

Titus 3: 5. Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.

1 Peter 3: 21. The like figure whereunto, even baptism doth also now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

We give these passages, taken from the Confession and the Catechism, without comment. They contain others of similar import; but these may suffice. A candid mind

cannot but be struck with the pertinence of these quotations to the design of establishing the doctrine of the efficacy of Baptism; and with the correspondence between the explicit teaching of the Confession and the forcible language of the New Testament. It would be simply absurd to suppose that the Westminster Assembly could adopt such language, and quote such passages of Scripture, if after all they intended only to teach that Baptism is a figure of grace, but does not really confer or make over in the sacramental transaction what it represents; or that it is only a sign of the covenant, but does not introduce the party baptized into the covenant and make him a partaker of its spiritual benefits.

In accordance with the doctrine of baptismal grace taught by the Confession, the Directory for Worship assumes that baptized children are *Christians*, and prescribes the manner in which they are to be treated accordingly:

“Children, born within the pale of the visible Church, and dedicated to God in Baptism, are under the inspection and government of the Church; and are to be taught to read and repeat the Catechism, the Apostles’ Creed, and the Lord’s Prayer. They are to be taught to pray, to abhor sin, to fear God, and to obey the Lord Jesus Christ. And, when they come to years of discretion, if they be free from scandal, appear sober and steady, and to have sufficient knowledge to discern the Lord’s body, they ought to be informed it is their duty and their privilege to come to the Lord’s Supper.” (Chap. 9, 1.)

The Directory presumes that baptized children are in the covenant, or in a state of grace; and not in a state of nature—a state in which they were in virtue of their natural birth. They are, therefore, called *young Christians* (Chap. 9: 2.); and are to be taught to pray and obey the Lord Jesus Christ. It is presumed that, being taught to repeat the Catechism, the Apostles’ Creed and the Lord’s Prayer, and brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, they will grow up in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ; so that when they come to years of discretion they will be pious and possess sufficient knowledge

to discern the Lord's body. If there be nothing to contradict this presumption—if they be free from scandal, appear sober and steady, they are to be informed by the minister, or officers, or parents, that it is their duty and privilege to come to the Lord's Supper. As they were baptized into Christ for the mortifying of sin and quickening of grace; as the grace promised was not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred on them by the Holy Ghost in the ordinance; as they were buried with Christ *by Baptism* into death; and as they who have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ; they are to be treated as those who are saved according to His mercy, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; they are to be taught to walk in newness of life, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father; and they are to be carefully instructed, watched over and prayed for, that they may not fall short of, or walk contrary to, the grace of Baptism, but that they may grow up to assurance of pardon of sin, and of all other blessings sealed to them in this Sacrament. (Vid. Lar. Cat. Q. 168.) When, therefore, baptized children have come to years of discretion, they are to be examined in order to ascertain whether they have improved the grace of Baptism, and if they have properly improved it, admitted to all the privileges of the Church.

Whether true or false, Scriptural or antisciptural, such is evidently the confessional theory of the Presbyterian Church concerning the condition, character and treatment of baptized Children—a theory that gives no countenance whatever to the modern system of periodical excitements, a system which repudiates “the grace of baptism,” looks upon the baptized and the unbaptized as alike out of grace and children of the Devil, and trusts to extraordinary operations of the Holy Ghost, that is, operations which are independent of, and unconnected with, the Sacraments, as the only hope of the Church.

In the seventeenth century, and especially during the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly (1688), no one un-

inspired man exerted so decided and controlling an influence upon the government, and upon the formation of the theological opinions of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, as John Calvin. As this is a historical fact, no one will gainsay it. It will be in place, therefore, to refer to what he says on the efficacy of Baptism. If his views contradict our interpretation of the Confession, there will be room for the presumption that there may be a flaw in the reasoning; but if he hold the theory which we find in the Symbols, he is to be regarded as bearing witness to the truth of the position which we have taken.

Opposing the opinion that Baptism is administered only for the remission of past sins, Calvin says: "We ought to conclude that at whatever time we are baptized, we are washed and purified for the whole of life. Whenever we have fallen, therefore, we must recur to the remembrance of baptism, and arm ourselves with the consideration of it, that we may be always certified and assured of the remission of our sins." (Inst. B. 4, Ch. 15, 3.)

Commenting upon Rom. 6: 3, 4, he says: "In this passage he (Paul) does not merely exhort us to an imitation of Christ, as if he had said, that we are admonished by baptism, that after the example of his resurrection we should rise to righteousness; but he goes considerably further, and teaches us, that by baptism Christ has made us partakers of his death, in order that we may be ingrafted into it. And as the scion derives substance and nourishment from the root on which it is ingrafted, so they, who receive baptism with the faith they ought to receive it, truly experience the efficacy of Christ's death in the mortification of the flesh, and also the energy of his resurrection in the vivification of the spirit." (B. 4, Ch. 15, 5.)

The following passage is equally explicit: "The last advantage which our faith receives from baptism, is the certain testimony it affords us, that we are not only ingrafted into the life and death of Christ, but are so united as to be partakers of all His benefits. For this reason he dedicated and sanctified baptism in His own body, that He

might have it in common with us, as a most firm bond of the union and society which he has condescended to form with us ; so that Paul proves from it that we are the children of God, because we have put on Christ in Baptism." (Ch. 15, 6.)

Speaking of the relation of Baptism to original sin : "And therefore even infants themselves bring their own condemnation into the world with them, who, though they have not yet produced the fruits of their iniquity, yet have the seed of it within them, even their whole nature, is as it were, a seed of sin, and therefore cannot but be odious and abominable to God. By baptism, believers are certified that this condemnation is removed from them ; since, as we said, the Lord promises us by this sign, that a full and entire remission is granted both of the guilt which is to be imputed to us, and of the punishment to be inflicted on account of that guilt ; they also receive righteousness, such as the people of God may obtain in this life ; that is, only by imputation, because the Lord, in His mercy, accepts them as righteous and innocent." (Ch. 15, 10.)

We make one quotation more : "Now as we have stated what was the design of our Lord in the institution of baptism, it is easy to judge in what manner we ought to use and receive it. For as it is given for the support, consolation, and confirmation of our faith, it requires to be received as from the hand of the Author Himself: we ought to consider it as beyond all doubt, that it is He who speaks to us by this sign ; that it is He who purifies and cleanses us, and obliterates the remembrance of our sins ; that it is He who makes us partakers of His death, who demolishes the kingdom of Satan, who weakens the power of our corrupt propensities, who even makes us one with Himself, that, being clothed with Him, we may be reckoned children of God ; and that He as truly and certainly performs these things internally on our souls, as we see that our bodies are externally washed, immersed and inclosed in water. For this analogy or similitude is a most certain rule of sacraments ; that in corporeal things we contemplate spiritual

things, just as if they were placed before our eyes, as it has pleased God to represent them to us by such figures: not that such blessings are bound or enclosed in the sacrament,* or that it has the power to impart them to us; but only because it is a sign by which the Lord testifies His will, that He is determined to give us all these things: nor does it merely feed our eyes with a fair prospect of the symbols, but conducts us at the same time to the thing signified, and efficaciously accomplishes† that which it represents." (B. 4. Ch. 15, 14.)

The language of the great Reformer is direct and clear. If it teach any thing, it is, that, in the right use of Baptism, we put on Christ and become children of God; that we truly experience the efficacy of Christ's death in the mortification of the flesh, and the energy of His resurrection in the vivification of the spirit; and that the ordinance conducts us to the thing signified and efficaciously accomplishes that which it represents. Bearing in mind the close relation which Calvin sustained to the origin and development of the Presbyterian Church, these unequivocal statements of his views concerning the efficacy of Baptism ought to be regarded as the strongest collateral evidence of the truth of the interpretation which we have given to the Confession of Faith.

We have now carefully analyzed the Symbols of the Presbyterian Church on the efficacy of Baptism. The legitimate conclusion which we have drawn from them is, that they teach, that as a sign Baptism represents grace, and a seal assures the party baptized of being introduced into a state of grace; that it not only offers, but also really exhibits and confers that grace on those, whether of age or infants, to whom it belongs; in other words, that, in the

* The word must certainly be employed here in a restricted sense; and the whole clause be directed against the Roman Catholic dogma, according to which a Sacrament is efficacious, *ex opere operato*. Otherwise Calvin would deny of baptism, in this passage, what he so positively and studiously affirms of it in other places, and even in this Section.

† *Neque tantum nudo spectaculo pascit oculos: sed in rem presentem nos adducit, et quod figurat, efficaciter implet.* Lib. IV. Cap. XV., 14.

right use of the ordinance, the *party baptized is ingrafted into Christ, is regenerated, and receives remission of sins, by the working of the Holy Ghost.* This conclusion is confirmed by the numerous passages which the Symbols quote from the Word of God ; by the rules, laid down in the Directory for Worship, for the training of baptized children and their admission to the Lord's Supper ; and by the unequivocal teachings of Calvin, than whom no man exerted a more decided formative influence upon the theological opinions as originally held in the Presbyterian Church. Indeed it is difficult to see how the Confession could have employed more explicit language, and given more apt quotations from the Scriptures, than it has, in order to teach and establish the doctrine of efficacious baptismal grace.

In the light, now, of what must undoubtedly be regarded as the true Presbyterian theory concerning the nature and efficacy of Baptism, we proceed to examine the manner in which Dr. Atwater disposes of the Confession, the Catechism and the Directory, in his enquiry into the *status* of baptized children. The question which he proposes to answer is not : What is the *status* of children of believing parents in virtue of their natural birth ? nor, What is the *status* or position of children in virtue of the operations of the Holy Ghost ? The question is a very different one. From the introductory remarks we learn what has been the occasion of the article. Many "are wholly at a loss as to the precise *status* of baptized children, the manner and extent in which baptism either signifies, seals, or procures any advantage which they would not possess without it." (p. 4.) Speaking of those who desire to escape both "lifeless rationalism" and "equally lifeless formalism," he says: "Believing that there is both precious truth signified, and blessing sealed by infant baptism, and that it is of God, they would not surrender it for worlds. Yet they can not define its nature and effects fully to their own satisfaction, although they possess some dim and struggling conceptions of them." (p. 4.) Hence they crave more light as to the

"precise import and efficacy" of Baptism, and urge the author "to examine and discuss the subject." The subject, then, is, *the nature and effects, or the precise import and efficacy of baptism.* The real question, accordingly, which he proposes to answer is: *What is the status of baptized children in virtue of Baptism?* And the conclusion at which Dr. Atwater arrives, must be regarded, in order to accord to him either candor or consistency—and we have not the least disposition to do any thing else—as his answer to *this* question; and not as an answer to either one of the two other questions just stated. Indeed there is neither point nor propriety in the whole article unless we take the result of his discussion to be a statement of the precise import and efficacy of Baptism. We take pains to determine this point, not only because it is in place to do so, but because in the progress of discussion he fails, as we think, to hold one question steadily before his eye, sometimes seeming to discuss the position of children in virtue of Baptism, and at others their position in virtue of being born of believing parents.

In entering upon the discussion of the subject, Dr. Atwater says: "The catholic doctrine on this subject, as shown in the creeds of christendom, is, that the children of believers are members of the Church, and are to receive baptism as the badge of such membership, and seal of the duties and privileges pertaining to it. But great divergencies of opinion and practice prevail in reference to the kind of membership involved, and the doctrinal and practical consequences which thence result." (p. 5.) We must dissent from the respected author at the threshold of the argument. The creeds of Christendom do not teach that the children of believers are, as such, members of the Church, nor that Baptism is a badge of membership previously existing. They teach the reverse. The covenant is certainly designed for the children of believers as really as for themselves; in this sense children of believers are included in it; but they are not members of the covenant, nor of the Church, in virtue of their natural birth. Natural

birth gives them the *right* to membership, but leaves them outside of the Church as long as they remain unbaptized. The male children of the Jews were included in the promise, and therefore had a right to circumcision, but they were excluded from all the privileges and blessings of members of the Church so long as they were uncircumcised. The Reformed Symbols proceed upon the same theory. Baptism is ordained "*for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church,*" says the Confession, (Chap 28, 1), an authority which Dr. Atwater will not refuse to acknowledge. It is almost superfluous to add that, if by Baptism children are admitted into the Church, they are not, and can not be members so long as they are unbaptized. All that the Confession and the Catechisms say concerning the blessings conferred in the right use of the ordinance, involves the same principle. To the same effect the Heidelberg Catechism teaches that, by Baptism, as a sign of the covenant, infants must also be "admitted into the Christian Church, and be distinguished from the children of infidels." (Q. 74.) To multiply authorities is unnecessary.

The creeds of Christendom* teach accordingly that, whilst children of believers are included in the design of the covenant, they are not members of the Church in virtue of their natural birth, but become members in virtue of Baptism. The error of Dr. Atwater consists in confounding the *extent* of the covenant and the *right* of children of believers, with actual membership in the Church—an error which is traceable through the greater part of the whole article, and even renders ambiguous the final conclusion at which he arrives. Yet he is not always consistent even with himself. Discussing the practice of baptizing the children of non-communicants, he speaks of "parents being *by baptism* in the Church." (p. 17). If in the Church, or members of it, *by* Baptism, they are assuredly not members of it *without* Baptism. Without Baptism children of believ-

* No one certainly would say that the creeds of the Roman Catholic Church regard the unbaptized children of believing parents as members.

ers are in the world. Still the prevailing idea of his article is the one with which the author starts out.

Having laid down this untenable position, Dr. Atwater passes on to consider several false views concerning the import of Baptism :

1. That "they are members only *quasi*, or in such a sense that the Church owes them no duties nor privileges, above the unbaptized." "Although they are born, in a sort, members, and as such have the seal of baptism, yet this is a token and pledge of nothing but of that Christian instruction and training, which all pious parents impart." (p. 6).

2. That baptized children "are members of the Church universal, but not of any particular organized Church." (p. 7). The theory held by Dr. Dwight and some other New England divines. With the consideration of this theory he connects a succinct history of Baptism among the Congregational Churches of New England, particularly of the *Half-way Covenant* practice.

These theories Dr. Atwater presents as false, and argues against them. Of course in doing so he implies that the truth lies in opposite propositions, to wit, that baptized children are not only *quasi*, but in some sense, real members ; that Baptism is something more than a token and pledge of Christian instruction and training ; and that children become members by Baptism of some particular organized Church. If the course of argument be relevant at all to the subject in hand, he must mean that the benefits which baptized children possess, denied by the theories rejected, but affirmed by implication by himself, are derived from Baptism. And it follows that Baptism must have some force or efficacy, and convey something. But if he wishes to imply only that in virtue of natural birth children of believers are, in some sense, real members of the Church and have a pledge of something more than Christian instruction, he commits two errors : he maintains what the Confession of Faith sets aside, and besides perpetrates a fallacy—a *mutatio elenchi*. For he is professedly discuss-

ing the precise import or efficacy, not of natural birth, but of Baptism.

To determine the true position of baptized children, the author refers to the Symbols; for they express the faith of the Presbyterian Church "with great precision," and "exhibit the truth in the premises intact and inviolate." He gives a number of extracts in full from the Confession, the Catechisms and the Directory, including those which we have quoted. Without attempting an analysis or exposition of these extracts, he proceeds immediately to say: "To preclude misconstruction in any quarter, we observe, at the outset, that these articles deny all intrinsic efficacy to the sacraments, as such." (p. 21). Deny all *intrinsic* efficacy! According to these very articles a Sacrament is the union of the thing signified with the sign; Baptism signifies and seals an ingrafting into Christ, regeneration and remission of sins, that is, assures or certifies that the thing signified is real and certain; grace and salvation are inseparably annexed to the ordinance; by the right use of the ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and *conferred* by the Holy Ghost to such, whether of age or infants, as that grace belongeth unto; and they are *baptized into* Christ for the mortifying of sin and quickening of grace.

Yet directly in the face of such explicit language, teaching the faith of the Church "with great precision," Dr. Atwater says that the Symbols *deny* all intrinsic efficacy to the Sacraments. We are utterly at a loss to comprehend how a gentleman of candor and a Christian scholar can make such an assertion. If the efficacy of the Sacrament of Baptism is not intrinsic, what then is it? Is not efficacy in the very nature of the case intrinsic? Does it not lie in the subject of which it is predicated? If not, if it lies in something else, it is an evident impropriety to speak of *its* efficacy. If the efficacy of Baptism does not lie in baptism itself, where can it lie? In faith? But faith as such is not Baptism. In the Holy Ghost? But the working of the Holy Ghost as such is not Baptism. In prayer

and instruction? But neither are these Christian duties Baptism. No matter where efficacy lies, if it does not lie in Baptism itself, it is wrong to affirm the efficacy of Baptism, for the ordinance has no efficacy. To affirm or admit the efficacy of Baptism, therefore, and yet mean nothing more than the efficacy of something which is not Baptism, is a direct contradiction of terms—a contradiction in which Dr. Atwater involves the Symbols, when he asserts that they deny all intrinsic efficacy to the Sacraments. With all the care they take to set forth explicitly, and define, the efficacy of this ordinance, they must be understood as referring to the efficacy of something else, of something which is not Baptism, and as teaching that Baptism itself has no efficacy at all!

But, with all due respect for his sincerity and intelligence, we must add that the author involves himself also in a logical contradiction. The whole discussion proceeds on the assumption of efficacy in Baptism, and aims at determining what its precise import, or that efficacy, is. Hence he argues against several theories, because they divest the Sacrament of all positive force. Hence, also, he quotes the Symbols as authority in the decision of the question, because they teach "with great precision," nay more, in so many words, that the grace promised is really conferred by the Holy Ghost in the right use of Baptism. But when he comes to define precisely what the efficacy taught by the Symbols is, he says: "These articles deny all intrinsic efficacy to the Sacraments." The "nature and effects" or "the precise import or efficacy" of Baptism, consists in this, that Baptism itself possesses no efficacy at all! Sacramental signs and seals of themselves convey nothing. (p. 24.)

Yet, paradoxical as it may be, what is to be taken as the final conclusion or result of the discussion, is inconsistent with his denial of intrinsic efficacy. He says: Those incapable of a credible "profession, may be visibly members of the Church, by virtue of God's revealed covenant or promise to be their God. This is precisely the case with

infants and the ground of their baptism. But in either case, membership in the visible Church is founded on a *presumptive* membership in the invisible, until its subjects, by acts incompatible therewith, prove the contrary, and thus, to the eye of man, forfeit their standing among God's people." *Membership in the visible Church is founded on a presumptive membership in the invisible.* The rest of the article is devoted mainly to an argument in support of this proposition. Under one view, Dr. Atwater's position involves a great and profound truth. The outward is grounded in the inward, the visible in the invisible, the natural in the spiritual. The admission of an adult or infant into the Church implies real union with Christ, as the basis of all external relations.

But the precise import and bearing of the author's position depends upon the way or means by which, in his judgment, the membership of an infant in the invisible Church is constituted. The same questions meet us again. Does an infant become a member presumptively of the invisible Church, in virtue of *Baptism*? Or does it become such in virtue of *being born* of believing parents? According to the answer given to these questions, does his position acquire peculiar significance.

Membership in the invisible Church is vital union to Christ, or regeneration by the Holy Ghost. The word *presume* means to admit a thing to be, or to receive a thing as true, before it can be known as such from its phenomena or manifestations. To presume an infant to be a member of the invisible Church, is therefore to believe it to be ingrafted into Christ and regenerated, before it gives any ordinary evidences of the fact. If, now, the author means that the presumptive membership of an infant in the invisible Church is constituted by *Baptism*, his position harmonizes with the teachings of the Presbyterian Symbols. And that he wishes to be understood thus would be inferable from another carefully worded remark: "The administration of the seal is founded on the *presumption* that the things sealed will also be bestowed and accepted, till the contrary

is shown. On no other ground can infant baptism have significance or propriety." (p. 24). In the previous statement, however, the *presumption* pertains to what precedes or attends, and, in this, to what follows, membership by Baptism in the visible Church. But we will not dwell on the inconsistency. He holds, therefore, that in the right use of Baptism an infant is ingrafted into Christ and regenerated by the Holy Spirit. Interpreted philologically,* and with logical propriety, it can mean nothing less than this. His language teaches the doctrine of baptismal regeneration with all needful plainness. But in doing so, he directly contradicts his assertion that the Symbols deny all intrinsic efficacy to the Sacraments, and that sacramental signs and seals of themselves convey nothing.

If, on the other hand, Dr. Atwater means that the presumptive membership of an infant in the invisible Church, or its vital union to Jesus Christ is effected, by *natural birth*, his position is entirely different. 1. He contradicts the Standards of the Presbyterian Church; for, as we have already shown, Baptism is ordained, according to the Confession, *for the solemn admission* of the party baptized *into the visible Church*. 2. He teaches a very novel doctrine. "Our standards assert," he says, "that the children of believers are members of the visible Church—not *quasi*, but absolutely." But "membership in the visible Church is founded on a *presumptive* membership in the invisible." And presumptive membership in the invisible Church, is the belief of vital union to Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost. On this principle of interpretation, it follows, then, that children of believers are ingrafted into Christ, or regenerated, by the Holy Ghost, in virtue of natural birth. A new doctrine for a *Presbyterian*! Natural generation is the channel of grace, and not the ordinances of the Church.

* We have read the author's exposition of the word *presumptive* given in the *Presbyterian*. Whilst his effort to explain away the legitimate meaning of the word in order to disclaim the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, does not in the least break the force or affect the import of the language used, it shows very plainly, however, that he does not believe, and did not intend to teach, what his language clearly conveys.

3. He gives no answer to the question proposed for discussion. The nature and effects, or the precise import and efficacy, of Baptism, consists in this, that children of believers are presumptively members of the invisible Church in virtue of natural birth! We do not suppose that Dr. Atwater himself would say that such a conclusion has any connection with the premises.

Yet there is no escape from these consequences. The position of the author must be interpreted, if interpreted with any consistency at all, on one principle or the other. The alternative can not be avoided by asserting that the presumptive membership of infants in the invisible Church, or their vital union to Christ, is constituted by the working of the Holy Ghost. For in either case the only efficient agent is the Holy Ghost, whether the relation be constituted by Baptism or by natural birth.

Nor can the alternative be avoided by replying that the vital union of infants to Christ has no connection with either Baptism or natural birth. Grace flows through neither as its channel; but the children of believers are ingrafted into Christ by the Holy Ghost, operating independently of either birth or Baptism. What, then, has Dr. Atwater's conclusion to do, not only with the theme of the article, but with the whole discussion? Does not the significance of the whole argument hinge on the position of children who are born of believers, or of children who have received the solemn rite of Baptism? These are the main points in the enquiry. But if the proposed solution of the question, has no respect either to the benefits of natural birth or to the efficacy of Baptism, the whole discussion ends literally in nothing. A long and patient argument is conducted with a view to a certain end; but when we reach the end, when we come to what is proposed as a final conclusion, we have a proposition that has no connection at all either with the premises or with the argument. Certainly nothing else can follow, if both principles for interpreting his main conclusion are disallowed.

The inconsistencies and contradictions of Dr. Atwater—we speak respectfully, for we would not regard the author in any other light than as an earnest Christian scholar—arise from a persevering endeavor to perform an impossibility. The Symbols of the Presbyterian Church take high ground, as we have seen, on the subject of Baptism, as high as that of any other Protestant Symbol, that of the Episcopal Church not excepted; whilst Dr. Atwater may be regarded as expressing his own views when he says: “These articles deny all intrinsic efficacy to the Sacraments as such;” and, “Sacramental signs and seals of themselves convey nothing.” Under these circumstances, he undertakes to determine the *status* of baptized children; and in doing so seeks to establish a theory which will reconcile the Symbols with the denial of the intrinsic efficacy of Baptism. As this is impossible, he swings from one point to another, and involves himself in self-contradictory positions. Unwilling to hold the plain doctrine concerning Baptism taught by the Symbols, yet unwilling to renounce their teachings entirely, he labors in vain to reach a conclusion which will avoid both alternatives; for there is no real middle ground between the doctrine of Sacramental grace, and the Socinian theory which resolves the Sacrament into an empty, lifeless form.

Thus we come back to the point from which we started out. The high views of Baptism inculcated by the Presbyterian Symbols are rejected by Dr. Atwater himself, as well as by those from whom he seems to differ, and whom he seeks to enlighten. We can see no essential difference between them. Both he and they deny the *intrinsic* efficacy of the ordinance. Sacramental signs and seals in themselves are but an external ceremony. Baptism can not convey or really confer any grace. Assigning to words their proper meaning, we may, therefore, resolve the author's theory into what he attributes to Evangelical Churches in general: “We are sure,” he says, “it is no exaggeration, when we say, that in a considerable portion of our Evangelical Churches there is no recognition, no conscious-

ness of any relation being held by baptized children, prior to conscious and professed conversion, other than that of *outsiders* to the Church, in common with the whole world lying in wickedness." (p. 6.) No views concerning the relation of baptized children to the Church, essentially different from these, can be held by those who deny all intrinsic efficacy to the Sacrament of Baptism.

Here we find the true cause of the extensive neglect of infant Baptism, over which the *Princeton Review* so justly laments. The estimate is based on a judicious comparison of the Statistical Tables extending from 1807 to 1856, and sustained by a patient collection of facts from various other sources. According to these Tables, there was a gradual increase of the ratio of infant baptisms to the number of communicant members, from 1807 to 1811; but since that time there has been a gradual decrease, the lowest ratio occurring in 1849. In 1811 there were at the rate of 198 baptisms for every 1000 members; in 1849 not more than 49. "In 1811 there were only 23,639 communicants, and yet there were 4,677 baptisms. And yet, in 1856, with *ten times* as many members, we have only *twice* as many baptisms of children." (p. 84.) After making due allowance for the operation of special causes, and adopting the principle that there should be at least one baptism for every ten communicants, the author of the Article, comes to the conclusion, that "if there are in the Church more children than one for every ten members, it follows, that *more than half** of the offspring of the Church are deprived of this ordinance." (p. 86.) The announcement of this estimate, as was to be expected, startled the whole Church, and called forth a number of communications on the subject in the weekly periodicals, nearly all of which, however, take the

* "We must conclude that whilst there were but 205,041 children reported as baptized, during the last twenty years, the reports should have amounted to 618,339, leaving not less than 413,298 unbaptized. Thus have more than two-thirds of the children of the Church been 'cut off' from the people of God by their parents' sinful neglect, and by the Church's silent acquiescence therein! Is this indeed true? Is the one-half of it true? Then, indeed, is there not '*great sin*' resting on the Church."—*Princeton Review*, Jan. 1857, p. 86.

ground that there must be some error in the calculation, although no one has been able to discover it. One objection was thought to be unanswerable. According to the *Census* the increase of population by birth, per year, is less than one to ten; how then could there be *one* child in the Church for every *ten* communicants, not to speak of *one* for every *six*? But it must be remembered that the *Census* pertains only to the *net* increase of population; whilst, in estimating the probable neglect of Baptism, the Church must take into account *all* the children of believing parents, one-fourth (or one-third) of whom, on an average, die during the period of infancy and childhood. Hence the *Census* Tables can furnish no basis of judgment as to the true ratio of baptisms. The Statistical Tables of the Presbyterian Church must furnish that basis; and according to these we can see no reason, painful as the fact may be, to doubt the correctness of the estimate.

Various causes are assigned for such great neglect of infant Baptism, namely, the extraordinary efforts of the various anti-pedobaptist bodies to disseminate their views within the past thirty-five years—the neglect of pastors to give full and proper instructions to their people—the improper administration of the ordinance—the Church's failure to recognize baptized children as members after Baptism—neglect of family worship—the time and circumstances attending the administration of baptism, being such often as wholly to destroy the moral effect of the ordinance itself—and the influence of the "new measure" system. No doubt each cause assigned has had its influence. But all of them derive their force from a cause that lies far deeper. The Presbyterian Church has been drifting away from its Standards. The actual faith in regard to Baptism contradicts the faith which she professes. Hence the great practical defection. As Baptism is held to be but an outward ceremony, as it can convey no grace, both ministers and people must become comparatively indifferent to it, and then neglect it.

Here, we repeat, is the true cause. The *practice* of the

Presbyterian Church is founded on its original *faith*. The one is the legitimate consequence of the other. If, therefore, it renounce its *faith*, it must also, in the course of time, just as it has done, forsake its *practice*. If the doctrine of baptismal grace, so plainly taught in its Standards, be given up, infant Baptism will be given up too; for, reduced to an empty, inefficacious ceremony, the people will have no sufficient motive to perpetuate its observance. The effect is natural and necessary. And so long as the immense contradiction of its *actual* to its *professed* faith, in which the Presbyterian Church is at present involved, continues, the cause of the sinful neglect of infants must continue to operate also, and the effect will as naturally follow, despite all the efforts to the contrary. To restore its practice, the Church must return to its original faith. If the Church renounce her lifeless formalism; if she revive true spiritual views of the Sacraments, neither faithful ministers nor believing parents will any longer feel indifferent to the holy ordinance.

We are aware that our Presbyterian Brethren, for whom we cherish no other sentiment but that of affection and regard, pique themselves on their spiritual religion, and lament over and sometimes seem to pity, the spread of formalism, as they call it, in the German Reformed Church. But with what propriety? They observe a form as a form; they value and adhere to a mere outward ceremony, a ceremony which they believe possesses neither life nor power; and call this *spiritual* religion. Others observe a form, not as a lifeless form, but because it is a spiritual reality; they value a ceremony because there is in real union with it, a divine life and power; and our Brethren call this *formal* religion. Those, then, who believe in the form without the spirit; who observe a religious rite but deny its living power and efficacy, are spiritual Christians: but those who believe in the form with the spirit; who observe a religious rite, ordained by the great Head of the Church, as an effectual means of supernatural grace, are formalists! Novel logic! Do our Brethren reason thus on other points? Is a man a formalist who prays without ceasing, because he

believes in the *efficacy* of prayer as a means of grace? Is a minister a formalist who preaches the Gospel in season and out of season, because he believes it to be the power of God, and the wisdom of God unto salvation? How, then, can he be a formalist who values and observes the holy Sacrament of Baptism, because it is a sign and seal of ingrafting into Christ? No; such reasoning, if it deserve the name, is simply ridiculous, our opponents themselves being the judges. Truth requires the judgment to be reversed. To have the form and deny the spirit, is lifeless formalism. To adhere to and practice a religious rite, which has neither life nor power, is dead ritualism. To administer infant Baptism as a mere outward ceremony, to maintain it and contend for it, as having in itself no efficacy, and conveying no grace, is to convert a spiritual institution into an unmeaning and delusive show.

Such a lifeless ceremony, such an unmeaning show, can not long command the approbation, the confidence and regard of pious, intelligent and reflecting men, whether ministers or laymen. Nor can any efforts to define the status of baptized children, to determine the positive spiritual good derived to an unconscious child from an inefficacious outward rite, either prove satisfactory to an earnest, enquiring mind, or avoid a process of reasoning that is self-contradictory and therefore self-destructive. Baptismal grace and infant Baptism go together; but infant Baptism and the denial of baptismal grace, cannot be conjoined logically in theory, nor perpetuated in practice.

E. V. G.

ART. II.—CONSERVATISM OF COLLEGES.*

It pleases me that it has fallen my task to address you, in a salutatory manner, at the opening of the Autumn session. The season in which it sets in is more delectable, it seems to me, than was even that of the Spring. Buds and blossoms and flowers are all good enough things in their time, and we enjoyed them while they lasted; but, after all, they were not wholly satisfying in their nature, and right glad am I, that we have reached at length the full fruition of the year; that the time of mellow apples, and juicy pears and delicious peaches has come, and that very soon, nay even now in some places, can be had, for the reaching, the purple clusters of the grapes. Over the landscape too, it charms me to feel, is now stealing softly a shade of sadness, an incipient mellowing, brought on by the cooler evenings, presaging to us, we are aware, the approach of frost and "the sear and yellow leaf," which, however, wakes in us no fears, but rather, falling in with our feelings, disposes us to repose or contentment or to quiet, pensive musings on the past. Our college buildings, after the same manner, it gratifies me to see, are no longer mere forms of hope and promise, but actual structures, finished, consecrated and taken possession of. Nay from them already, methinks, at any rate under the sober light of the season, is beginning to show forth a sort of ancient semblance. The main edifice, the college proper, with its antique towers, is fast putting on a venerable, weather-stained aspect, especially beneath the window sills, and the Society Halls, with their stained glass and Gothic work and Grecian figures painted inside, stand invested, though in their first bloom,

* Delivered before the students of Franklin and Marshall College at the opening of the Fall Term, September 17th, 1857.

with old and classic associations. Moreover, antecedent to the erection of these buildings our Institutions possess a history. Lying back in time before the consummation of the great consolidation, they have an age which they are fond to claim as their own. In their remote halls now deserted, amid the mountains of Mercersburg, were brought out that profound learning and philosophy which it makes us proud to think we are still bearing with us. This anterior time, we fancy, will be regarded ever, if not as the golden or fabulous, at any rate as the heroic period of our Institutions' history. Already indeed, by the old alumni who, at our Commencement festivals, favor us with their presence and sometimes charm us with their speeches, are remembered "with advantages" the enjoyments of those almost Arcadian times and the feats that were there performed; whose stories, of course, to successive classes, will be handed down with still greater embellishments, so that, in ages long hereafter, the admiring freshman or sophomore, drinking them in under the most marvelous enlargements they will then have come to assume, will be filled with amazement and say, as we read concerning the times before the Flood: "There were GIANTS in the earth in those days!"

Leaving, however, our own particular Institutions, we think, as a general thing, it belongs to colleges to make persons connected with them *conservative* in their modes of thinking. In the minds of those who come under their care or influence, they have the power of awakening up a warm regard for the past, a keen relish for the classical and the antique, an admiring respect for the ancient and the venerable.

In Europe, Institutions of learning and science, it is true, in the way of arousing up such feelings, have over those of our own country a decided advantage, on account of their far greater antiquity. Many of them were founded in the most ancient times. Some of them date back almost co-equal with civilization itself. Around their buildings has gathered, in the course of years, a venerable grandeur.

Their antique towers, their vaulted domes, their sounding halls, their libraries replete with learned tomes, are redolent of the oldest associations ; and their grounds overgrown with venerable trees, and walks once trodden by youthful feet of men afterwards renowned, have all become hallowed through years, and are pervaded throughout by a charming atmosphere not only classical but also romantic.

In our own country, of course, around our Institutions, being comparatively modern, are clustered fewer old associations. Still in these they are not wholly wanting. With those colleges founded in the first ages of her history are connected stories, less romantic, it may be, but certainly older than is even that of Rip Van Winkle or the renowned legend of Sleepy Hollow. During the Colonial times, corroborative of the worth and sound learning of the men educated in log colleges, then almost the only kind, many are the marvelous tales that are told ; and during the Revolutionary war, when halls of learning more substantial and commodious had been erected, of the noble youths who went forth from them to do their country's service, valorous and mighty are the deeds recorded. Throwing aside their Virgils and their Homers and girding on their swords or seizing their rifles, from their quiet retreats they sallied forth and on the battle-field performed exploits in courage and daring equal almost to those of the renowned, classic heroes of whom they had been reading. With the academical buildings themselves of those times, independent of their students, is connected also often an interest on account of some memorable incidents having fallen out in their immediate neighborhoods. Who, for instance, has never heard of that renowned feat at Princeton performed by the valorous cannon ball, discharged we know not whether from a British or American twelve pounder, which, as if possessed with prophetic impulse or patriotic wrath, after having penetrated through the stone wall into the chapel of Nassau Hall, with its force still unexpended, from his bust there standing struck off the head of George the Third ? And never afterwards was that head replaced, we

are told, but, in its stead, when the war was over and our government established, as if being more deserving of future homage and respect, was set up the victorious head of General George Washington.

Still we are constrained to admit, that this power possessed by our colleges of awakening up a love for the past, has not been acquired from our own country. It was brought over from abroad. By the founders of our first colleges and by their teachers, who came, of course, from Europe, from their *Almae Matres* there, this sacred love for the ancient was brought along and placed by them, like a Vestal fire, in their new Institutions, where it has never since been suffered to go out, but rather made to multiply itself from having been communicated to all similar Institutions afterwards founded throughout our land; in most of which, notwithstanding their great number and variety, fed with its proper aliment, it is still kept burning. In the breasts of their students was this pious love first kindled and afterwards nourished by the learned lectures of the able professors from abroad, breathing of the ancient spirit, and then by the course of instruction pursued, which, with little variation, had also been imported, and, most of all, by the classic authors retained in this course, and still used to be read and studied in our colleges, most of which, we all very well know, sprang not at first from modern Europe, but preserved in libraries, monasteries and universities for ages with pious care, have come down to us even from the palmiest days of ancient Greece and Rome. From Europe too were brought over along, at the same time, it becomes me to mention by the way, many old forms and observances, which, notwithstanding our plainer republican manners, are, most of them, still religiously held on to, or if some of them have been sacrificed to the spirit of progression, it has been always done with great sorrow and reluctance. That fashion, once universally observed in our colleges by both students and professors, of wearing, on all public occasions, their long black gowns, is still stoutly maintained and preserved, we are pleased to know, at some

of the oldest of them. At a few, indeed, the most conservative, on their Commencement festivals, the president while conferring the degrees, of course in classic Latin, always wears, as of old, not only his red velvet gown and band, but besides donned for the nonce, to give still greater importance to this crowning act of the day, his venerable, three-cornered cocked hat, which, throwing around his academical and clerical brows an almost officer-like sublimity, has always struck me as being most wonderfully grand and imposing.

While speaking, however, of the ancient charm which, notwithstanding their newness, is resting upon our colleges, and of their faculty still retained of cherishing a warm regard for what is past, we would by no means be thought to state that this power of theirs is ever exerted to the disparagement of what is new ; or that upon their scholars' minds their ancient learning is ever inculcated to the neglect of those arts and sciences which in after life can be turned to more practical account. While in them the liberal studies are thoroughly attended to, we are all aware, that the exact and scientific are very far from being neglected. In mechanics and the sciences, with their advancement in the world, the instruction imparted in our colleges always keeps ample pace, and indeed sometimes, from the previous scientific research of those who give it, goes often before in its disclosures and leads the way. Our Institutions of learning are not only conservative but also progressive. As is the case with all well constituted governments, so within themselves do they contain two equal but almost opposite forces ; each of which, acting by itself, might prove destructive ; but when combined, as they are in our colleges, they form together a resultant force ; which, in the new direction it imparts, is perfectly safe, and as happy even as is that which urges on the motion of a planet and keeps it in its proper course and sphere.

Of still keeping up, however, in our colleges this equality of forces, I am well aware, that by some persons now-a-days

is denied the necessity and indeed called into question sometimes even the propriety. Living in an age that is eminently progressive and in a country which, notwithstanding its newness, by the grand achievements of its arts and sciences, has gone ahead of even the oldest nations, to make advancement still farther and faster in the same direction, ought we not, they inquire, to make it our chief aim and throw forth all our energies? With the spirit of our age should not our Institutions of learning breathe in full unison and with the genius of our country should not their course of instruction be made fully to correspond? Casting aside then the ancient classics and mythologies as the "worn out fancies of an elder world," should not our students be required to prosecute only those useful studies which in their after lives they can turn to the best practical account?

To such inquiries, thus confidently put, we are pleased to know that, by our wisest citizens and by such as we think understand best the genius and wants of our country, it has not been replied in the expected affirmative. While with our conquests in the practical arts and sciences already achieved they are highly gratified, and while, that in these our future doings will be as great, if not even more glorious, they feel confident, yet, to incite us to further efforts in this same direction, that we should neglect the other departments of learning they deem it by no means necessary. Of the two great branches of the arts, the useful and the polite, at the expense of the one to foster the other, in the course of years, they are inclined to think, would produce in any nation a one-sided, unnatural development. The same opinion with the old Athenians do they still maintain that to education it belongs to bring out and forward, in their full and equal proportions, all the faculties and feelings of our nature, and that no people by cherishing some of these to the neglect of others, can ever become permanently great and happy.

Did the classical studies pursued in our colleges call up in their students nothing more than a warm regard for an-

cient things and a disposition to hold on to long established usages, they would be doing for our country a highly important service. To the want of time-honored institutions and old castles and abbies and ruins in our land is perhaps partly to be attributed the well known fact that now-a-days many of our youths, having never come under the humanizing and moralizing influences of these, are too much disposed to be carried away wholly by every thing that is new or exciting. Their feelings are not sufficiently restrained by a proper respect for settled institutions. They hold in too low estimation the wisdom and experience of the past. Where no regard for ancient things is entertained, of course, no reverence is felt for what is pious and holy. Parents and persons in authority are less honored and religious duties less observed. Controlled by the prevailing spirit around them of Young Americanism, as it is called, under which they have fully come, when arrived at manhood, whether in public or private life, they dash forward often heedlessly and recklessly without any conscientious scruples, into daring schemes and speculations after wealth and honor, which, in the end, generally prove disastrous to themselves and involve others. Indeed so aspiring often grows this spirit, long indulged, that, at length, in its powers and soarings, it can not, by any "pent up Utica," be confined, or even by the whole territory of the United States, where in fact it might sometimes be too much constrained by existing law and order, but driving those possessed by it beyond the limits of these, it wafts them onward, to gratify their reachings after wealth and fame, into wild filibustering expeditions abroad. Happy will it be then for our country if our colleges, at any rate, are in anywise calculated to modify or restrain this spirit; if the young men under their care and instruction, who, in after life, from the important positions they may attain to in government and society, will be likely to exert a powerful influence over the morals and feelings of the communities in which they will move, from the sound principles in which they have been indoctrinated, and especial-

ly from their veneration for established things, into which, by their liberal studies pursued at these colleges, they will have been humanized and charmed, will be disposed and able in any manner to withstand and correct the outbreaks of this spirit and turn them in a proper direction !

Besides calling up, however, for past or established things this useful veneration, the classical studies perform for us, at the same time, another essential service. Sometimes persons, we know, possess a passionate fondness for ancient things, while they are deficient in a corresponding taste to distinguish. They love them merely on account of their oldness or rarity. Antiquarians or virtuosoës are they but not connoisseurs. Of what is old, between the base and the valuable, the worthless and the worthy, they have no power to discriminate. To guard against this perversion these studies are abundantly qualified ; for they bring also, at the same time, into full and active exercise the taste and the imaginative faculties. The analysing of words and sentences and selecting of suitable terms and modes of expression by which to render them into another language, quickens the natural tact, and wakens up a nice sense of propriety, a keen power of discrimination. By coming into communion, too, with the literature of a people who were so pervaded throughout by a delicate sense of the beautiful in art and nature, that they could not help showing it outwardly in all their works and creations, and who used a language in its construction so flexible and, in the many forms of which it was susceptible of being thrown into, so graceful and polished as to be capable of containing and setting forth, through the finest expression, every varied style of prose and verse, how can it ever be that, of the student who has thus been brought to fully appreciate its worth and feel its spirit, the imagination will not become improved and strengthened and the taste more cultivated and refined ? If overcome by Grecian letters even the conquering Romans were subdued and chastened in their manners and induced to cultivate and cherish the liberal studies which they prosecuted afterwards so thoroughly, that at

length they became distinguished for poets, orators and philosophers, certainly there is no nation now existing so wholly practical or utilitarian in its feelings and pursuits as to be utterly incapable of being touched by this same literature, and drawn by its influence into a warmer love for the humanities and the fine arts.

And let no one suppose that these studies and arts are less deserving, than those which are purely scientific or mechanical, of his care or pursuit, because they relate wholly to the beautiful and can not be turned to any practical account ; because they seek merely to give satisfaction and pleasure to the imagination, the taste and the feelings, and do not, like the mechanical arts, exert themselves on material things for the attainment of what is deemed some more important ultimate object ; because they save no labor and make no money, and do nothing whatever towards the driving onward of the shining car of Improvement ; because they throw forth no inventions to be secured by patent right, and are wholly useless towards the overcoming of time and distance by subjugating to their control the natural forces and applying them to the rapid conveyance of travelers and merchandize, and, in that greatest of all modern achievements, to the transmitting to the remotest places, even through the ocean,—for the failure of the Atlantic telegraph is not conclusive—quicker than a flash, unseen intelligence ; all of which things have been brought about by modern Science alone, we are free to admit, and the liberal arts can boast no share in their accomplishment. While, however, feeling justly proud of these great results, most of which have been brought out by our own intelligent and enterprising countrymen, and glad on account of the benefits thus being conferred on mankind, and while anticipating still greater conquests in the same direction, let us not, however, in our admiration of Science and the useful arts be carried beyond all bounds, so as to be led to pronounce them all-efficient. Of course, in their operations, they are confined to their own appropriate domains ; and in the human breast are feelings and aspirations which,

with all their blessings, they can never be made to reach or satisfy.

Though by their discoveries and inventions and improvements has much pain been alleviated, and labor saved and sorrow soothed, and many indeed are the conveniencies and comforts which have been thrown by them around our social and domestic life, and though to contrive their workmanship and bring out their results, the highest powers of intellect are required, still, in their benefits, it must be conceded, they reach generally but little further than to the supplying or satisfying of our sensual wants. Some of the nobler faculties and feelings of nature that they may be made also in some measure to subserve, we are willing to admit, but to bring them into this more important service, altogether necessary is it that these same faculties and feelings have, in the first place, themselves been properly cultivated and refined in the community and their worth known and justly appreciated. This preparation too, of course, must necessarily have been effected by other agencies. By no means are we of the opinion of those who imagine that by Science and the useful arts alone all physical and moral evil can be overcome and the millenium finally brought about; that by the laws of mechanics and physics being thoroughly investigated and understood and their forces brought to bear, and by the true system of government being reached and practically adopted, society can be disenthralled from all sin and sorrow and restored to its primal, normal condition, or brought into the full enjoyment of a modern Utopia or Elysium. Of a State's being advanced to the highest condition of improvement within the powers of Science and these arts to bestow, and yet being nothing bettered in its morals, but rather made a great deal worse, we can easily conceive. Even in our own country, with all our boasted improvements in farming and manufactures, and in our facilities for travelling and transportation, have we in a corresponding, or indeed any manner, been advanced likewise as citizens, in our propriety of spirit and conduct? Are we now-a-days in any thing the

more just, and honest, and honorable, than we used to be in those good old times, slow, but sure, still fondly remembered by some of us, ere by locomotives had been usurped the place of horses, and by rail-road cars and telegraphic wires were performed the labors of stage-coaches and Pitt and Conestoga wagons? Is there less corruption now in our legislative halls and courts of justice? Is public credit as good? Of frauds and embezzlements, of burglaries and arsons, of robberies and murders are now our ears less frequently pained with the reports than they used to be? Do infidelity and wordliness and superstition appear now to be less in the ascendant than they were in those simple times?

To constitute a nation truly great and happy the virtues must be cultivated. Not only must be brought out its physical forces and resources, but also its moral wealth. With respect also to ourselves, as individuals, to insure the promotion of our own usefulness and happiness in the world, not sufficient is it in any wise, that merely our intellectual faculties be cultivated. Of our whole being that the fair proportions may be preserved, equal, if not greater, attention must be paid also to the furthering of the full expansion of the moral and spiritual side of our nature.

To explain the principles of morality and the attributes of our spiritual nature belongs properly, I need not tell you, to the province of the chair of Psychology and Ethics, and to call them into wholesome exercise, to that of the sacred desk of the chapel. Taste, and the imagination, and perhaps even, to some extent, the feelings, form not themselves, we know, inseparable component parts of morals and religion, but along side of these they are naturally set and with them they are associated and connected as intimately as is the vine with the elm, ever loving to be throwing around them their clusters and foliage. To the fairer portion of our being they properly belong, and from the virtues they can not well be torn asunder at any time without violence and serious injury being done to them both. The cherishing of these, and the promoting of their full growth and vigor, is brought about especially, we fancy, by the study of the Humanities.

Over the affections even Science at times may exert a humanizing influence, and while analysing the blossoms or searching into earth's mysteries or surveying and measuring with her instruments the heavens, she may dispose the Imagination to spread her wings and she may send her into fiery kingdoms, which the ken of her own microscope can not detect; or into aerial regions which the reach of her own telescope can not take in. Still, to do this, falls not properly within her sphere. It is by the studies of the Humanities or polite literature, as we have just remarked, that the feelings and the imaginative faculties are the best cherished, and the taste the most cultivated and refined. This department, we know, is not confined to its ancient authors. It takes in also the moderns; but the former it becomes us to study in the first place for the sake of order. Independent of that excellent mental training, they make us go through with to master them, and their own intrinsic beauties to lure us on, we should study them, at any rate, first, on account of the place they hold. For our further improvement and entertainment, of our attention our best modern poets and writers may claim their full and appropriate share afterwards. Fully to understand these and appreciate their beauties, if on account of nothing more than their frequent and fine classical allusions, of the ancients a previous knowledge is absolutely necessary. We must begin always at the fountain heads. This, reason teaches us; and, in the present case, we can follow the plan with pleasure, for sweeter by far than the waters of "the Tiber, the Thames or the Mississippi," when we have reached Helicon, do we find those which gush from Hippocrene and more refreshing to the muses. So necessary, indeed, is order in reading or study, that even in Grecian letters themselves to enjoy in full the later ancient tragedies and lyrics of Athens, very familiar must we have made ourselves, in the first place, with those earliest poems, considered almost sacred by the ancients and still revered by us, the two charming epics of the blind bard of Chios. "If," says Gladstone, "the words of Homer are to letters

and to human learning what the early books of Scripture are to the entire Bible and the spiritual life of man—if in them lie the beginnings of the intellectual life of the world—then we must still recollect that that life, to be rightly understood, should be studied in its beginnings, where we may see, in simple forms, what afterwards grew complex, and in clear light what afterwards became obscure, and where we may obtain starting points from which to measure progress and decay along all the lines upon which our nature moves."

Thus, my young friends, in a rambling way, have I reached at length the application of my subject, which, after all, amounts to little more than a recommendation of the practice pursued by Pamphilus, as mentioned in the *Andria* of Terence:

Horum ille nihil egregie præter cætera
Studebat; et tamen omnia hæc.

Like him, prosecute none of your studies extravagantly to the neglect of others. Cultivate your hearts as well as your heads. While at your hands are receiving their merited attention the sciences, philosophy and history, at the same time, their appropriate share also be pleased to afford to the Humanities. Especially be not induced by any shallow sophistry to set aside or slight, as if at the present advanced stage of civilization and progress their prosecution were no longer required, the studies of the Grecian classics; but rather, as an antidote to the too utilitarian tendencies of the times, bestow on these your especial love. From their clear perennial fountains take deep draughts so that the fairer portions of your humanity may be refreshed and your hearts strengthened. We know that the Liberal arts may be perverted in their use; that painting, music and poetry may be cultivated by their votaries merely for their own enjoyment, and in that case, these will be rendered by their pursuit only the more sensuous—refinedly sensuous. By some sterner virtues must they always be supported. Like the vine, unless flinging their branches around the elm, they will fall to the earth and become groveling.

"Seek ye first" then, of course, "the kingdom of God and his righteousness." Drink ye deep also of Siloa's brook. Cultivate above all things the Christian virtues; yet, at the same time, by close application to your classical studies, cultivate also your taste and finer faculties with which to adorn those virtues. Then, when you go forth into the world, you will be well fitted for performing your duties as citizens, whether in public or private life, and for promoting, in the best manner possible, the interests of society, having always access to those sources of consolation and happiness, which not having been wrought out merely by intellectual appliances, but being connected most intimately with your spiritual natures, will not be so much liable to disaster or limited to time, but, being more than perennial, will outlast with you even the "wreck of matter and the crush of worlds."

W. M. N.

ART. III.—REFORMED DOGMATICS.

[CONCLUDED.]

The Period of Separation into different Schools in the Reformed Church.

THE different points of view, and modes of treatment growing out of the three principal elements in the Reformed Church, and discoverable, as we have seen, in its Dogmatics from the first, led to a sort of spiritual fermentation, from which the original tendencies came forth purified as particular schools. The non-predestination could not be kept quiet by the side of the predestination school. The first sought to enlarge its borders and this met with oppo-

sition in Holland. The expulsion of the non-predestinarians, as the immediate result of the controversy, may be regarded as unfortunate, but it must be admitted, if carefully considered, that Arminianism was a poor champion in opposition to absolute predestinationism. To say nothing of the political elements mixed up with it, it was deficient in a sound anthropological view of the Gospel, and fluctuated between a false supernaturalism and a moderate rationalism. It rejected predestinationism; but it also denied doctrines which were unquestionably true; and the God of Arminianism, to say the least, was as much a being of caprice and accident as the God of strict Calvinism.

The Arminian theory originated with Simon Episcopius, professor at Leyden, who was born at Amsterdam in 1583. He managed the cause of the Arminians at Dort in 1618, and drew up their Confession in 1621. He was afterwards Professor of Theology at Amsterdam, and there wrote his *Institutiones Theologicae*, which was published after his death in an unfinished state. In the writings of Episcopius, we still have a sound anthropological element, and so also in the *Theses theolog. et histor. of Gor. John Vossii*. On the other hand, the latent rationalism of Arminianism appears in the apologetic work of *Hugo Grotius, de Veritate religionis christianae*, and in his Dogmatic disputations. Finally, an abstract supernaturalism, closely allied to Socinianism is very prominent in the *Theologia Christiana* of the otherwise vigorous and scholastically acute Phil. von Limborch.

In the expulsion of Arminianism by the Synod of Dort, the Calvinistic predestinarian interest unquestionably achieved a victory, or at least obtained an ascendancy over the German Reformed and Evangelical Switzer element so far at least, that in Germany and Switzerland, the doctrine of absolute predestination was regarded to be indispensable to Reformed orthodoxy. But this outward show of victory was really a defeat; for that which was really true in Arminianism still survived, and was silently restored with increased vigor in the heart of the Reformed Church. In England and Brandenburg, the decisions of Dort were

not acknowledged. In other countries, the doctrine of predestination was received, it is true, and the theologians were required to teach it, and were not permitted to pass it by, but for this very reason, they did it in such a way as to strip it of all force. It was spun over again and so modified and conditioned that it was harmless. But even this was not all. In the first place, in opposition to the Scholastic school, the avowed advocate of orthodoxy, which referred every thing to the *eternal purpose* of God, there also arose, particularly in Holland, the *Federalistic school*, in which great account was made of historical human development, and the pure-Reformed biblical tendency was opposed as a corrective to the systematizing tendency of Reformed Dogmatics. In the second place, in opposition to this Scholastic school, there arose also, the Cartesian school, in which the *philosophical* element came to its right, and a strenuous effort was made to combine theology with natural science. In the third place, *Amyraldism* in France openly opposed absolute predestination; and although the Theologians of Geneva and Zurich had the advantage in the discussion, it proved, after all, as they were unable to maintain their ground, little better than a defeat. Thus the whole development of Reformed Dogmatics resulted in this, that predestinarianism, after its apparent triumph at Dort, gradually declined in inward strength, until at last, during the period of *Wolfianism*, it became extinct.

The Scholastic school derived its principal support from the Holland Universities, (Utrecht, Leyden, Gröningen, &c.) *Alsteds Theologia didactica vel scholastica*, a strict and acute development of particular Dogmas by the application of established categories, was soon imitated by others. *Samuel Maresius*, professor in Sedan and Gröningen, a pupil of Gomar, prominent in the opposition to Arminianism in 1652, wrote his *Foederatum Belgium Orthodoxium, sive confessionis ecclesiarum Belgicarum exegesis*, a scholastic commentary upon the Belgic Confession, in which the whole system of Church Dogmatics is strictly elaborated. But even here, the doctrine of absolute predestination is treated

with extreme caution. Fatalism, and every inference prejudicial to the idea of the freedom of the will, and of moral accountability, are entirely excluded, abstruse questions are avoided, and a sound, satisfactory exposition of the *Confessio Belgica* is given. *Maresius* afterwards, in 1659, brought out his *Systema Theologiae*, in which he takes decided ground against Popery; and, at the same time, regrets the controversy between the Lutherans and the Reformed, convinced as he was of the fundamental unity of the two Confessions. An accomplished scholastic, and a true type of the school, was the strict infralapsarian professor, *Marcus Fred. Wendelin*, of Anhalt. He wrote *Christianae theologiae systema majus*, published in 1556, after his death at Cassel. Wendelin is less profound, but more acute than *Wollebius*. Of still greater consequence than *Wendelin* and his associates, *Makowsky* in Francken, *Gomar* in Saumer, and *Gröningen*, *Alting* in Heidelberg, and others, was the distinguished *Gisbert Voetius*, professor in Utrecht, †1676. In him the Reformed Scholastics reached their culminating point and greatest perfection, although not in their original form. The investigation on every point was so minute, and with every positive explanation, there were connected so many problems and questions, that the limits of a theological system no longer sufficed, and the form of a *disputatio* was resorted to in its place. In this way every particular dogma, and every particular connected with the dogma (for instance, *de atheismo*, *de jure et justitia Dei*, *de adoratione Christi qua mediatoris*, &c.), was thoroughly discussed, and for the most part, upon the ground of some actual controversy. Thus *Gisbert* published five thick quarto volumes, under the title of *Gisbert Voetii, theologiae in Acad. Ultrajectina professoris, selectarum disputationum, pars I. II.*, etc. They embody a most elaborate system of Reformed Dogmatics and Ethics, and no one should think of writing a Ref. Dogmatic, without carefully studying this finished production. That it should be written in fine flowing style, is not to be expected. The language is the scholastic Latin of the Middle Ages, and

such terms as *futuritio*, *futuribilitas*, *privatio privans* and *privatio privata*, are found, not only on every page, but almost in every sentence. Gisbert is besides an ingenious and very decided Aristotelian. His questions frequently run into the essentially abstruse, for instance: Is the world *corruptibilis*? The answer is: Nature was not *essentialiter*, but *accidentaliter*, changed by sin. Again: Whether poisonous plants were created before the fall? The answer is: *Si non actu, saltem causaliter et virtualiter*. Still they are questions to which the system actually conducts. Questions of pure curiosity, such as whether the angels were divided into orders from the first, or whether it was done subsequently to the fall; whether these orders will continue after the day of judgment; whether the higher orders *per species magnas universales intelligent*, than the lower, Gisbert himself condemns and silently passes by as *curiosae et vanae disceptationes*. We must take the trouble, however, of searching for important dogmatic truths, as we would for diamonds in a dirt heap. The trouble will be richly repaid with such an exhibition of Reformed doctrinal views, as is no where else to be had. The doctrine of predestination especially is so admirably defined by Gisbert, that the whole idea of *determinism*, which Schweitzer holds up as a Reformed doctrine, is here expressly excluded in all its possible forms—if absolute predestination is even in reality taught.

In opposition to this eminent Scholastic, losing himself frequently, it is true, in abstractions, but always again exciting our just admiration by his great industry, and critical acumen and accuracy, at length appeared John Cocceius, properly Koch, †1669. He was professor at Leyden, and wrote a *Summa doctrinae de foedere et testamento Dei*. The object was, as he says, "*Auditoribus nostris praeire ad explanationem praecepti argumenti theologici de foedere et testamento Dei*. That a Reformed Dogmatic should be brought out and developed fresh from the Scripture, and that it is not for the Church alone, as an ecclesiastical court (as a council) to determine what is Church doctrine, but that the Church system itself should also be examined in a *free theo-*

logico-churchly scientific way, and be brought again and again to the test of Scripture, is purely Reformed. It never was the practice of the Reformed Church to proceed from a dogma to the Bible, but from the Bible to the system, and from the system to the dogma. It necessarily followed that the *healthy condition and vigorous strength* of the Reformed Church should react against the external authority of the existing predestinarian scholasticism. But for this very reason, the opposition was not simply *formal*, but *material*. The pure-biblico-anthropologico-soteriological mode of considering Christianity as the Gospel, for the solace and pardon of poor sinners came to its right. If the Scholastics regarded the whole history of revelation, and the whole historical development of each particular part, as a bird's eye perspective of the unchangeable decree of God, in which the historical evolution of a large portion lost its significance, and was reduced to a mere test of comparison: Cocceius, on the other hand, took the ground of the anthropological stand-point. With him it was precisely the historical development of Redemption which was important, and it was precisely in the diversity of the institutions of religion, in which God always suited himself to man's capacity for salvation, that he saw disclosed the wisdom and love of God. Cocceius, accordingly, may be considered, 1.) as the father of a pure biblical theology, and 2.) as having brought the anthropologico-historical stand-point in the Reformed Church again to its proper right.

As to his system, he proposed not simply to derive the material of his rubrics from the Scriptures, but the principle and order of their arrangement. He properly and profoundly saw in the very idea of the *foedus Dei* the principal basis of biblical theology. In this idea of the *foedus Dei* there was included, in the first place, not just the anthropological aspect, as perhaps in the idea of *justificatio*, nor merely the theological, as in the *decretum*, but that twofold aspect of the fundamental idea of all religion, which Zuingle already had brought out. In the second place, it included also the idea of religion, not in its subjective, but pure-

ly Reformed, its objective aspect. (Comp. the *Eccles. Dei* of Hyperius, which, by the way, is a far less significant, far narrower expression than that of the *foedus Dei*). In the third place, it in like manner included an idea, comprehending, not only the eternal contents of the dogma, but, at the same time, its biblico-historical development. This last was with Cocceius, this most zealous and productive Reformed Dogmatic, the ground of his divisions. He first unfolds the biblical idea of the *foedus Dei*, and shows that it was not a contract, in which there were *wants* on both sides, but a compact, in which God throughout is the giver, and man exclusively the receiver. And for this reason it is the fundamental law for man, that he *should* maintain his receptive relation towards God, and not, in a sinful perverse desire for independency, separate himself from God. To this end, man was made, and created a *rational, free and holy* being. The decalogue is nothing more than an external expression of this internal immanent law of mankind.* And this is now the *original covenant and original relation to God, identical with the nature of man*, and for this reason a *foedus naturale*, consisting on the part of man in *duty*, the rule of which is the *law of God*, and on the part of God, in the *promise* that man, in the free fulfilment of his duty, should attain to the *haereditas*, that is to a *status confirmationis*, of holiness and happiness, that would never be lost.† By man's own free will this natural covenant, or covenant of works, was broken by sin, and by this one sided violation of this absolute, legal compact, on the part of the feeble creature, he brought upon himself the *threatened curse*, with all its consequences, (thoroughly anti-predestinarian.) But as the compact was violated only on one side, man is still bound to fulfil *all things required, as well by the law of nature as the law of God*, that is; he is

* We at once perceive here an anthropological moral dependence, not a mechanical deterministic one—a dependence, in which man is *free to choose*, whether he *will* maintain himself in his receptive relation to God, and be free and happy; or whether he *will* separate himself from God, and *then* feel his dependence as constraint.

† A purely moral apprehension of the idea of salvation.

bound to obedience, just as he was before ; to submission to punishment for his disobedience, and at the same time, to *faith*, if it should please God to extend to him the hand of reconciliation ; for the fundamental law, to maintain himself as *receptive* towards God, remains in all its force. And inasmuch as God never denies his nature, his free-communicating love, so has he, *on his part*, revoked the covenant, *quoad damnationem*, already abolished on the *part of man*, *quoad possibilitatem vivificandi*, by substituting for it another covenant, the *covenant of grace*, resting, however, upon the same fundamental law, that God remains in the relation of freely giving, and man as willingly receiving. This *covenant of grace* rests upon the mission of Jesus Christ. The *revelation and promulgation* of this method of salvation embraces three periods ; the *oeconomia ante legem*, in which, we have the law of conscience, and the patriarchal protevangelists ; the *oeconomia sub lege*, in which we have the law of Moses, and the ritual as types of Christ, and the prophets, and the *oeconomia post legem*, when Christ himself appears as the perfect *personal law*, and redeemer. The *effects or consequences* of the *foedus gratiae* are finally, *a*) the *salvation of the individual*, by which the *foedus naturale* is revoked *quoad efficaciam metus mortis*, *b*) the *change of bodily death* from a punishment into a deliverance, by which the *foedus naturale* is abolished, *quoad luctum cum peccato*, and *c*) the *resurrectio*, by which the *foedus naturale* is abolished *quoad effecta omnia*. It is perfectly evident that the whole of this admirable system is un- and anti-predestinarian ; God does not appear as predestinating, much less as absolutely determining, and man as absolutely limited ; but God as graciously bestowing, and man as willingly receiving ; and it is only when he *will not receive*, that he is betrayed into an *unfree, constrained dependence* upon God. The *benefit*. *Dei* appears in the previous appointment of *Christ* as the Redeemer, and in the *electio* of those in Christ who *will to accept* of salvation.

The system of Cocceius, the system of the Foederalists, was perfected by his pupils, MOMM, †1677, (*de varia condi-*

tione et statu ecclesiae Dei sub triplici oeconomia patriarcharum ac testamenti veteris denique novi, 1653), FRANZ BURMAN, professor in Utrecht, †1681, (*Synopsis theologiae ac speciatim oeconomiae foederum Dei ab initio seculorum usque ad consummationem eorum*, Utrecht, 1671), JOHN BRAUN, professor in Gröningen, (*Doctrina foederum sive systema theol. did. et clencht.* Amst. 1688), VAN DER WAELJEN, professor in Francken (*Summa theol. chr.* 1689, Euchin.), and HERMAN WITSIUS, professor in Francken, Utrecht and Leyden, †1708 (*oeconomia foederum Dei cum huminibus*, 1685). As any system may be carried to an extreme, so was it done with this. The pupils, less ingenious than their master, sought their desert in drawing parallels between the *foedus naturale* and the economies of the *foedus gratiae*, and in showing, for instance, that there were two sacraments before the fall and two between the fall and the giving of the law, &c. In this way they were betrayed occasionally into intellectual sport, which, however, is often improperly attributed to them; especially by those who are not thoroughly acquainted with their system in all its magnitude. Burman was unquestionably a man of genial spirit, remarkable for his biblio-theological expositions, upon the basis of which he was accustomed to enter into the scholastic questions of his day, with great scholastic ability and mental acuteness, and satisfactorily solved, indeed, points of controversy, and corrected and completed many dogmatic propositions. Witsius was less intellectual and less acute, but was frequently distinguished by a hearty appreciation of his object; for instance, the regeneration of little children, and the relation of the freedom of the will to grace. It was the Foederalists, principally, who wrote the *Commentaries* upon the Catechisms, particularly the Heidelberg. In this, Cocceius himself led the way. Another celebrated work of the same kind originated with *Melchior Leydecker*, the Utrecht professor, who, although not a Foederalist, in the strict sense, was, nevertheless, in spirit, of the same tendency. Besides this, Leydecker was the author of a Dogmatic, in which it was his purpose to carry out and perfect the foederal system, by referring the *oeconomiae foederis gratiae* to the three per-

sons of the Trinity—placing, at its ground, of course, as did Calvin, the Trinity of revelation ;—the Father exercising the office of Judge ; the Son that of Mediator, and the Holy Ghost that of Comforter :—the Father, in his office, unfolds the righteousness of God, and exercised the office, mainly under the Old Testament dispensation ; the Son, as Mediator, exhibits the mercy of God, and exercised the office in the days of his flesh ; the Holy Ghost, as Comforter, exhibits the omnipotence of God, and now exercises this office since the day of Pentecost. This grouping, however, is evidently artificial. The division of the three attributes among the three persons will not do, and the confounding of the Old Testament and the *oeconomia legis* with the office of Judge, and the ignoring of the Gospel along side of the law in the Old Testament, is a great mistake, and a retrocession in comparison with the accurate and profound views of the real Foederalists. As it regards the Foederalists, they were not considered heterodox. The Reformed Church did not reject them ; they were not just tolerated ; but although there was a sort of discussion between them and the Scholastics, the necessity of such a complement was so felt, that it was the practice in the universities of Holland always to place at least one Foederalist along side of the Scholastics.

With this opposition between the Foederalists and Scholastics, in reference to the relation of the Bible to the teachings of the Church, was closely allied the opposition which sprung up at the same time, between the Scholastics and the *Cartesians*, who recognized the relation of revealed to natural truth, and especially of Christian doctrine to the discoveries of natural science. Cartesius, in Holland, brought his mathematics and philosophy both to bear upon theology. Whilst the Scholastics abruptly condemned the newly discovered Copernican system as unchristian, other theologians, (mostly Foederalists, although some were *Cartesians*) undertook to show that the Copernican system was reconcilable to Christianity, and in this way sought to honor the scientific *elastic* spirit of the Reformed Church.

The opposition, however, had reference not just to this point, but also to the relation of revealed truth, to the possibility of a natural knowledge of divine truths generally. Calvin indeed taught (Instit. 1. 8, 3.),—not in the way Schweitzer holds a *cognitio Dei innata*—that the truth, that there is an invisible God, as well as the moral law, is seated in the human soul, and can be proved to man from *a priori* principles, from the facts of consciousness. At the same time Calvin was careful to state, that this abstract possibility of the knowledge of God *a priori*, never is actualized in unconverted men; unless with the assistance of divine revelation, and its bearers from without. Besides, the perverseness of the will is in the way, so that the possibility of the knowledge of God never is actualized. A *theologia naturalis* along side of, or rather before a *revelata*, was accordingly justified in this sense, that it did not construct a knowledge of God, *a priori*, as one unknown, but simply directed to God, as made known by revelation, and as one also proved to us by the facts of consciousness. In this sense, the Scholastics also admitted a *theol. natur. Mares. orat. inaug. Revelatio supernaturalis praesupponit in homine lumen naturae et usum rationis*. But: *absit a nobis, ut revelationem subjiciamus rationi cum revelationis sit, corrigere et erigere supra sphaeram activitatis suae nativae*. Gisbert Voet. expresses himself in a similar way. He maintains the *innata Dei cogn.* against the Arminians, who hold that the *intellectus hominis* is *instar tabulae rasae*. (Comp. Eb. Dissertation *de cogn. Dei innata*, Erlangen, 1841.) This, however, was first perfected and made use of in the construction of the system, by the Cartesian school. Cartesius commenced his philosophical system in scepticism in a good sense. He first placed the idea of a development of knowledge over against the scholastic exhibition of the finished material furnished to hand. This idea was introduced in theology; and here we saw at once that there was occasion for the question, how and in what way does the theologian obtain his matter, of what is he certain from the first, and what is there that depends upon other propositions. As the

Foederalists rejected the *theological material* in its OBJECTIVE development (in the history of the revelation of God to mankind), so had the Cartesians to do with the SUBJECTIVE development of theological knowledge (how the INDIVIDUAL came to the knowledge of Christianity?) This method also had its right. At the same time, there must be a distinction made between the way in which we become a Christian, and the way in which we become a *theologian*; it must be seen that the immediate synthesis of the *obscurely felt* subjective need of redemption with the *felt* truth of the objective fact of redemption is the *first*, and the knowledge of Christ and his Father, is the *second*, and that the philosophical reconstruction of the aprioristic part of consciousness (self and divine knowledge) can only follow as the *third*, inasmuch as man must first have known God, before he could have known himself. But here it failed. It is true, Burman admirably distinguishes both. But with Latin divines, the *immediate consciousness* of a God is directly identified with the aprioristic knowledge of God, and a *theologia naturalis* so understood, as if it was in the power of every natural man, without ever having come into contact with the revelation of God in Christ to construct it for himself, and it is placed as the first part, before the *theologia revelata*, as the second part. In a more decided way, than with Burman, who never makes the division into *theol. nat.* and *revelata* the ground of his division, but, as already remarked, only acknowledges the existence of a *religio nat.*, and on the other hand, shows with great penetration that *theol. systematica* (theology in our sense) can only and exclusively proceed from *theol. habitualis*, the knowledge in faith, the immediate inward synthesis of the need of redemption and the fact of redemption, (*Ille ergo Theologus proprie dicitur qui cum in mysterio Evangelii salutariter sapit, donis spiritualibus inuoluptat catenus est instructus, ut possit alios ejusdem mysterii cognitione imbuerere, ad gloriam Dei et laudem gratias Christi*)—Cartesianism was exhibited by Ab. Heidanus in his *Corpus theologia*, Leyden 1687, who, at the same time, connected a strict predestinarianism with his system. In op-

position to Cartesianism we meet particularly with the Scholastic, *Peter von Maastricht*, professor in Utrecht, †1706, *Theoretico-practica theologia*.) After a full expression of the points in dispute on both sides, a sort of reconciliation was effected by one of the most accomplished Reformed dogmatics, *Sol. Van Til*, professor in Dort and Leyden, †1713, in his *Theologia utriusque compendium tum naturalis, tum revelatae*. Van Til was led to prepare his compendium by a decree of the State's general, that such questions, as could only be solved by an appeal to revelation, should be discussed exclusively by theologians. He accordingly distinguished between, *a) articuli puri*, such doctrines as could neither be constructed *a priori*, nor yet be proved from philosophical principles; *b) articuli mixti*, such truths as have first received their full light and power from revelation, but were still innate in the mind and could be philosophically made out. The same distinction was made by *Benedict Pictet*, in his *Dissertationes de consensu et dissensu inter reformatos et Augustanae confessionis fratres vindiciae*). Van Til teaches admirably and conclusively that there is a *theol. natur.*; its *existence* he maintains against the Socinians; its *convenientia cum veritate revelata* against the Lutherans; but its *insufficiencia ad salutem*, he asserts against the Pelagians. Besides this larger compendium, Van Til also published a smaller, entitled: *Ἐποταμώσεις τῶν ὑγαινοντων λόγων, sive compendium theologiae viri reverendi ac clarissimi, Sol. Van Til*. This smaller compendium is most convenient for ascertaining the Reformed dogmatics, and supplies the want of a *Hutter. redivivus*. It presents indeed very properly the ripe fruit, the pure product of the Holland school, an organic union of Scholasticism, Foederalism and Cartesianism. With Van Til is also to be compared *Campejus Vitringa*, professor in Francken, †1722, *doctrina christ. rel. per aphorismos summam descripta*, 1690. *J. Mark*, professor in Leyden, †1781, *Compend. theol. christ. didactico-elenchiticum*.

If the strength of the doctrine of predestination was indirectly broken by Foederalism, the Amyraldists of the

Reformed Academy at Saumur, by introducing another historico-anthropological method of treatment, ventured directly to assail it. *Cameron*, and particularly his pupil *Amyrant*, (cf. *form. Cons. Helv. can.* 6) taught: That God certainly has not, solely for the purpose of revealing his righteousness, predestinated from the mass of natural men, a certain number, no worse than the rest, to be lost, and for this reason, has either altogether withheld from them the gift of the Holy Ghost, or granted it to them, only for a short time; but that *amore electioni praevis motus*, or *misericordia prima*, he desires sincerely the happiness of all men, upon the condition of their faith. He accordingly has appointed Christ to be the Saviour of all; and has chosen those whom he foresaw from eternity, that they would believe, *non simpliciter ut peccatores in Adamo primo, sed ut redemptos in Adamo secundo*; from those, however, whom he foresaw, that, if even the Holy Ghost were given to them, they would not believe, he withheld the gift. In this a *gratia resistibilis* is admitted. It is substantially the true Lutheran view; only that it is an external, unnecessary and unjust concession to predestinarianism, to say that God withholds the Holy Ghost from those whom he foresaw would not believe, for the purpose of preserving the appearance of a predestination.

There was also a captious sort of disputation by *La Place*, upon the question, whether Adam forfeited salvation for the race, as the Scholastics profoundly maintained, or only for himself, and that mankind was deprived of salvation, by original sin, as *La Place* less learnedly held, inasmuch as original sin is a consequence of Adam's fall. In opposition to the Amyraldists, the Scholastic school of Switzerland rose up, and all intercourse with Saumur was broken off by Geneva and Zurich. Amongst the opponents of Saumur, *Joh. Henry Heidegger*, of Zurich, was particularly conspicuous, who not only revived the old predestination system in all its strictness, in his *Medulla Theologiae* (Zurich, 1696,) his *Medulla medullae*, 1697, and his *Corpus theologiae*, 1700, but was very active also in the compilation of a new

symbolical book, the renowned *Consensus Helveticus*. Here Amyrant's propositions were rejected, and in opposition to *La Place*, it was maintained, in entire misapprehension of the Scholastic view, that the natural man is condemned with Adam, not just *on account* of original sin, but altogether *aside* from it. Finally, in opposition to Capellus, the inspirations of the masoretic points in the Hebrew text were declared to be matter of fact. But the brilliant victory was soon changed into a rather ignoble defeat. By means of the public authorities, an unsuccessful attempt was made to introduce the *Cons. Helv.*, as of symbolical validity in several of the Cantons. In Neuchâtel and Vaud it utterly failed, and in Zurich, Bern, Schaffhausen, Basel and Geneva, it succeeded only for a short time. In 1686, the Reformed Church of Brandenburg protested against it; Basel and Geneva worked it out of the way, and it was not very long before it was nowhere acknowledged.

The eighteenth century brought out the *Reformed dogmatics purified from predestination*. There no longer existed different schools, but the several schools of the seventeenth century were fused into one. The sound kernel of scholastic terminology was retained; the ground idea of Foederalism was in the ascendant; and the proper free position of philosophy was acknowledged. Thus the Reformed dogmatics acknowledged the influence of *Leibnitz*, the greatest of Christian philosophers. Leibnitz had brought out the idea of the concrete personality, and had placed it at the ground of his system. This idea passed gradually over into Reformed dogmatics and protected them against a return to a predestinarianism resting upon abstract conceptions. It is true, the influence of the *dark sides* of the Leibnitz school, as they appear particularly with his pupil Wolf, was also felt. On the one hand, there was no distinction made between personality and individuality. Accordingly God is represented, not as pure personality, but also as individuality, as anthropopathically choosing between different possibilities (thus the shallow notion of the possibility of other worlds which God might

have made, and of which he chose the best). On the other hand, the attempt to construct every thing *a priori*, or to prove every thing from rational principles, which although it is here only referred to the *Art. mixti*, still conducts to the mistake of some of the old Cartesians, that it was not sufficient to *refer* the truth derived from the *Artic. mixti*, acknowledged in revelation, to the facts of consciousness, but they must be proved directly *a priori* from reason. By not observing the influence of a guilty conscience upon the understanding, we fall over into *Intellectualism*.

If we now review the best of Christian Dogmatics of the eighteenth century, we will find that *Fr. Turretin* of Geneva, is the first in the transition to a new period. His *institutiones theol.* were reproduced by *Leonard Rypenius*, professor in Deventer, and appeared at Berne, under the title: *Rypenii summa theologiae didactico-elenchticae ex celeberrimorum theologorum scriptis, praecipue Francisci Turretini institutionibus theologicis*. Again we have *Werenfels* (*Dissertationes theologiae*). Properly *Wolfians*, were *H. W. Bernsau*, professor in Francken, †1763; *John F. Stapfer*, professor in Berne, †1775; *Daniel Wittenbach*, professor in Marburg, †1779. Influenced by Wolfianism were both the last two distinguished Reformed Dogmatics: *John Christoph Beck*, professor in Basel, and *Samuel Endeman*, professor in Marburg, †1789. Besides these there was a school formed in Bremen, (*Lampe* and *Menken*, which acquired a very great and very happy influence. Free from Wolfianism, inclined to Foederalism, and combining with it the element of a profound and pure mysticism, it constructed the doctrine of the importance of the corporeity, and was efficient in promoting a deeper apprehension of the doctrine of the holy sacrament. In addition to this, *Menken* had a peculiar one-sided anthropological, but impressive and affecting doctrine of the atonement. *Menken* was influenced by the Lutheran physician, *Samuel Collenbusch*, and the Wurtemberg divines, *Bengel* and *Oetinger*. Not satisfied with the orthodox view that God was necessarily obliged to *punish*, and that Christ endured the *punishment* in our stead, and

thus reconciled God to us, he taught, that Christ reconciled men to God; that man by reason was unable to love God, and that he purchased for him the psychological ability again to love him. But he did not see that this ability consisted in the removal of the *sense* of guilt; (he sought it simply in the removal of sin by the *trials* he endured). He did not see that *his* doctrine, properly considered, was nothing more than the *anthropological aspect of the orthodox doctrine itself*.

In the Church of the Lutheran Confession, Dogmatics had to pass through a different course. To Melancthon's *loci* were attached the *loci* of Chemnitz and Gerhard. Here the dogmas were treated separately and afterwards externally put together. *Hutter* belongs to this class. *Calov* first commenced a systematic development; and introduced Scholasticism in the Lutheran Confession, which was perpetuated by *König*, *Quenstedt*, *Baier* and *Hollaz*, already pietistically affected. The Lutheran Dogmatics, as to form, took precisely the course opposite to that of the Reformed. In Reformed Dogmatics, the systematic process was first pursued—the dogma was developed from the system—and then the local treatment was adopted first by the Scholastics. In the Lutheran, the local treatment was practised at first—each dogma was treated separately, and the systematic was afterwards introduced by the Scholastics. In the one case, the system was original, inferential and synthetic; in the other it was superinduced by the Scholastics and was analytic. They were alike, however, in this, that in both Confessions, very important contradictions sprung up in the course of the seventeenth century, only with this difference, that in the Reformed Church, these contradictions, for the most part, were taken up and settled, whilst in the Lutheran, this was not the case. In this way, the so-called Syncretism of Calixt, and the Helmstadt school, was repressed and kept down. Calixt desired in fact to revive the Philippistic tendency in the Lutheran Church; but the real Lutherans, those who interpreted the Augsburg Confession in the Form of Concord sense, maintained their ascendancy, and kept Philippism out. The consequence

was the triumph of a stiff Scholastic orthodoxy, stripped of all ethical elements—a triumph resulting in the almost utter extinction of the life of the Church. The little of life that remained passed over, in the form of opposition to the dogmas of the theologians, into the *pietistic* school of *Spener*; but this emancipation of the congregation was essentially a Reformed, a foreign element. A violent controversy was kept up against the pietists, while in Holland, the Foederalists were peacefully tolerated along side of the Scholastics. This already was so far unfortunate that it brought out no theological science as a corrective to scholasticism; that which did exist proceeded from the congregation in opposition to the Theologians. For *Franke* and *Spener* were simply practical ministers, without any pretensions to learning; and the scientific men, who fell in with them, did less to introduce the life of pietism into science, than to carry science into the sphere of popular piety. Amongst these, we may reckon, *Joach. Just. Birthaupt*, *Joh. Joach. Lange*, and *Dannhauer*, the last of whom represents Dogmatics under the figure of a journey. A few, such as *Buddeus* and *Christ. Matt. Pfaff* and *Wiseman*, enjoyed the reputation of being scientific men. As a general fact, science and living piety became widely separated.

After that *Quenstadt* and *Baier* already had borrowed the doctrine of the *articulis mixtis* from the Reformed Dogmatics, the Lutheran Wolfians, *Reinbeck*, *Carpon*, *Reusch* and *Ribow* made such free use of it, that they soon were prepared to prove that even in the *artic. puris* there was nothing contradictory to reason. Thus reason seemed to be the highest criterion of the dogma. This unfortunately came to be the case, just in proportion as this dry, lifeless Wolfian orthodoxy was withdrawn from the life of the congregation, and the more it was separated from its living source, the power of a living faith, the less finally was the life of the congregation nourished and regulated. Thus we can very readily conceive that the result of the rigid exclusion of the Lutheran theologians from the congregation, and from the influence of the life of the congregation, would be that Lu-

theran theology would in the end, fall a victim to Rationalism ; and it is just as easily to be seen how the Reformed theology, owing to its elasticity, and the readiness with which it receives and submits to correcting influences, and especially to its connection with the *congregation*, the Rationalist scarcely had a single representative amongst Reformed Dogmatics. At best we might mention, *H. D. Stosch*, professor in Frankfort, the junior *Stapfer*, otherwise a very cautious Kantian, and *Mursinna*, professor in Halle. The Congregations would *permit* no Rationalism in the Reformed Church, when it existed and could exert its influence without restraint. To the Reformed Confession belonged the last efficient defenders of the old faith, *Hess*, *Lavater*, *Stilling*, *Gessner*, and so also the first champions of the revived faith, *Neander*, *Tholuck*, *Schwartz*, *Sack*, *Krafft*, and by descent also *Hengstenberg*, joining hands with each other.

As the first attacks upon Christianity plainly proceeded from the English deists, the Reformed theology kept deism aloof, and combatted it successfully. When, however, it was transplanted to Germany, in reckless opposition to Christianity, the Lutheran theology assumed a very different position. Once accustomed to prove Christian doctrine by rational arguments, the attempt was made to do this gradually in such a way that it would harmonize with and be agreeable to the so-called "reason," subjective and without contents as it was. *Semler*, and *Reinhart*, and *Hermes*, silently suffer the fundamental Christian doctrine of redemption to fall into the background, divest it of its objective significance, although they still think it very appropriate on account of its influence in a moral point of view. The Eudamonists, *Teller*, *Krug*, *Eberhard* and *Steinbart* identified their exceedingly shallow senseless moral systems with "reason," and explained every thing in Christianity transcending it, as of secondary importance, as popular superstitions and accommodation. This was the sense in which *Wegscheider*, *Eckerman* and *Henke* wrote their Dogmatics. The *Kantians*, ignoring the substance of Christian-

ity as redemption, identified it also with the moral law, only that it was more profoundly apprehended. So *Stäudlin*, *Ch. F. Ammon* and *Tieftrunk. Bretschneider*, in his rationalistic-supernaturalistic Dogmatic took a position more like that of Semler; he gave himself no concern about dogmas—he disparaged them as accidental, uncertain and without significance.

Thus far the so-called reason maintained a destructive position towards the Christian dogma. With the introduction of the more profound philosophy of [Fichte, Jacobi and Hegel, a new period was commenced. It was conceived, that to be rational was not, in the neglect of all historical development, to deduce a few propositions from an arbitrarily chosen principle, but that reason was the perception of the contents of nature and history. In this way respect was again cherished for the *history* of Christianity. It was required that Christianity should be regarded as a historical phenomenon, a historical power. And Christianity was actually so considered, but it was also thought that evil in like manner pertained to objective rationality, i. e., was a necessary element with a view to future good. (Ethical Pantheism—to every thing actual, is *divine*.) In a little while, it was farther inferred, that as the world-process absolutely fell in with the phenomenal nature of God, God was the truth of the world, and the world was the actuality of God. (Intellectual pantheism—to actuality, is *God*.) Thus in failing to accept of history as it is, and constructing it *a priori*, we are betrayed into subjectivism. We desire to find again a subjective pantheistic system in Christianity, and thus are led to construct Christianity itself *a priori*, i. e., we change its form, a redemption founded in fact, to an element in the development-process of an idea, i. e., of the spirit of our common humanity. The commencement was made by *Schleiermacher* in his “*Glaubenslehre*.” He occupies as yet the subjective stand-point, inasmuch as he develops the dogma from the expressions of the pious consciousness. It is true, that with him, the pious consciousness is that which

is defined by the historical Jesus of Nazareth, and by the communion which he established, and also by the historical power of Christianity. But as he appreciates only the particular aspects of history which are reflected as feelings in the subjective consciousness, he moves with peculiar hesitation between subjectivity and objectivity. His subjective philosophical view, influenced at one time by Fichte, and at another by Jacobi, is at last that of ethical pantheism, and is of no little importance. He derives sin, as necessary from the opposition of like and dislike, which naturally belongs to the pious consciousness. The more distinctly, however, that this influence of the new philosophy was to be seen in him, the less ground is there for the notion of Alex. Schweitzer, that he was influenced by the old Reformed Dogmatics (with whom Schleiermacher was not acquainted) and that Schleiermacher's modern Pantheism is similar to the supposed determinism of the old Reformed Scholastics, a notion, which professor Baur, in Tübingen, allied to him in spirit, takes care to correct. Schleiermacher's subjective sense of dependence has very little resemblance to the objective decree of the old Reformed Dogmatics. In his anthropological subjectivism, he is substantially much more closely allied to the Lutheran standpoint, than to the Reformed.

More consequent than Schleiermacher, the Hegelian *Marheinecke* sought to reconstruct the objective Christian dogma as a necessary development, in such way indeed, that sin, *contrary* to reason, as it is, would necessarily be included as reasonable, and that ethical pantheism also is made prominently to appear. It was not long before the Hegelian school passed over from ethical to intellectual pantheism, and again appeared in *opposition* to Christianity, and as destructive to its dogmas. *Strauss*, in his well known Dogmatics, apprehends Christianity simply, as historical development, and not as a historical divine fact of eternal significance; and not even as a development absolutely, but only as a subordinate element of the same, that must be surmounted from the stand-point of absolute

knowledge, and accordingly not as eternally permanent, but as a surmounted element in the development of humanity. Here, as in the older Rationalism, there is the radical defect, that Christianity is apprehended, not as the redemption and reconciliation of sinners, by the grace of God, but, either in a *Pelagianising* way as a moral law (as if the mere law would be of any avail, and as if sin was not an enslaving power in humanity), or in a *pantheistic* way, as an element in the development process of an idea, by means of which the ethical is simply a subordinate consideration.

With the revival of faith, and of a believing theology, the Dogmatic was reproduced, and at the same time so as to recur constantly to the old Dogmatics, and more also in the way of historical representation. A productive, independent Dogmatic of this kind, is that of *Twesten*, and also the "System of Christian doctrine," by *Nitzsch*. We also have very valuable monographs, for instance, "*der Lehre von der Sünde*," by *Julius Müller*. In the Reformed Church, during the period of Rationalism, with the exception of the younger *Stapfer* and *Mursinna*, there appeared no Dogmatic. During the time of revived faith, the deceased *Krafft* prepared his, but it is still unprinted.

Remark.—The so-called "*Glaubenslehre der evang. Reformed Church*," by *Al. Schweitzer*, is altogether useless. Under the pretense of giving a representation of the old Reformed dogmatics, he endeavors rather to smuggle modern Pantheism into the Reformed dogmatics, and to identify *Schleiermacher's* sense of dependence, as *deterministically* apprehended by himself, with the old *predestination doctrine*. The most remarkable errors, pervading the work, are: 1) *Schweitzer* derives the doctrine of absolute predestination in the Reformed dogmatics from a theological principle. It proceeds from the idea of God as absolutely determining all things, upon whom every resolution of the human will is absolutely dependent, and from this, subsequently comes to the conclusion, that belief or unbelief, and of course salvation or damnation, is dependent upon the predetermining appointment of God, and not upon the free decision of

man. But this is evidently a historical untruth, as was shown already by Schneckenburger (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1847). That Zuingle's predestinarian expressions, which with him from the first were connected with *theological* premises, were altogether without any influence upon the Reformed dogmatics, and that the proper origin of the Reformed doctrine of predestination is to be sought with Calvin, we have already seen. But with Calvin, as Schweitzer himself admits, the doctrine rests upon anthropological ground. And this is the fact. It was not from any previously entertained idea of God, but from the doctrines strictly carried out, that the sinner of himself was utterly unable to embrace the salvation in Christ, or even *preserve it*, that Calvin came, through a misunderstanding of several passages of the Bible, to the doctrine, that if any one held and cherished faith, it followed that God, through the Holy Ghost, had granted him *faith* and *perseverance*, and if any one was without faith, or again fell away, it must be the case that God had withheld *faith* from him, or at least *perseverance*. But that this, as Schweitzer improperly maintains, was not the common doctrine of the Reformed Church, and still less the principle of the Reformed dogmatics, we have already seen, and that the consequences of the same in reference to the doctrine of the being of God and his relation to the human will was never drawn, we will most clearly see hereafter. 2) Schweitzer identifies the subjective feeling of dependence in Schleiermacher's sense, that is, the fact of the consciousness, that man with all his power of thinking, still finds a world around him, that has not just come to exist so and so, by his subjective peculiar will, with the doctrine of the *decretum Dei*, as held by the old Reformed dogmatics. How senseless this is, Baur has shown in Zeller's Jahrbuch, 1847. 3) Schweitzer confounds in a singular way the *theol. naturalis* of the *Cartesians* with the *foedus naturale* of Cocceius. He forgets entirely that the Foederalists distinguish *objective-historical* consecutive periods of the objective kingdom of God, and call the period before the fall, *foedus naturale*, and on the

other hand, that the Cartesians, proceeding from the *subjective* consciousness of the fallen man, call that, which he still retains as a part of consciousness, *theol. naturalis*, and in this way gives us a wonderful *quid pro quo*. He distinguishes in the *foedus natur.* as do the Foederalists in the *foed. grat.* three *oeconomies*, i. e., one "taken exclusively from natural life," one "demanded by the ethical consciousness"—and one "the knowledge of God" advanced to full development by means of revelation." As if these were not merely three subjective moments! and as if these three moments previous to the fall, had followed in historical succession, and not much more in immediate unity! If he now changed the *phenomenal historical objective* part of the *foed. nat.* into the *subjective element of knowledge*, why should not the whole *foed. nat.* be changed from a *historical existing state*, into an element remaining after the fall, a *human disposition* analogous to the *destiny of man*. Again, he asserts that the only difference between the *foed. nat.* and *grat.* is this, that the last is a religion of redemption, and the only difference between *theol. nat.* and *evang.*, in like manner is that redemption is revealed. Very perverted; for the Trinity and other doctrines are also revealed. Finally, he confounds the antithesis between law and gospel as "Lutheran" (!) with that between the *foed. nat.* and *grat.* (as if it did not correspond with that between the *oec. sub lege* and *post legem*!) and from this interminable confusion, he finally draws the conclusion: that the Reformed Dogmatics first construct all religion from the natural life; it is then elevated by means of the moral consciousness, and finally by revelation, it is brought up to perfect life, by the *immediate elevation of the divine in the disposition*. Real nonsense! Mere potentialities of the natural life, and mere elements of the moral life, so long as they appear intermixed as the life of man, and are not yet directed to God, are by no means religion. Besides, the definition of revelation, as the "immediate elevation of the divine in disposition," is monstrous. Alex. Schweitzer may understand revelation to be this; the Reformed Dogmatics understand by it something very dif-

ferent, something objective. The whole affair is nothing better than an ineffectual effort, under cover of dialectic confusion, to introduce pantheistic Rationalism into the Reformed Dogmatics. It is true, that *theol. nat.* is able *a priori*, to know no more than the immanent law, in the fulfilment of which, the *foed. nat.* consists. But it is not true, that, on the other hand, the *foed. nat.* contained nothing more than the propositions of *theol. nat.* Schweitzer's whole proceeding is nothing more than an attempt to do away with the objective original state of man before the fall, and to change it into a new *disposition* existing in all men, even in sinners, to the good and the true. There is, however, no sense in his assertion, "that natural religion is by no means merely *foedus operum*, but at the same time is also the *oecon. ante legem et sub lege foederis gratiae*." As if one would say: "the perspective is not merely that of the moon, but also of the planets." A single glance into Burman or Heidanus might have taught him how *unreformed* all this confusion was!—4) The proposition, that sin is negative, i. e., a disturbance of the divinely appointed development, by means of the impotent will of the creature in conflict with God, is admitted, but precisely in the *contrary* sense: sin is *no* positive disturbance of human development, but simply the not yet perfected existence of good—(negative in the sense of limitation) that is, it is a necessary element of future good. 5) Schweitzer asserts that the Reformed Confessional writings are not the sources of the Reformed Dogmatics, inasmuch as they do not exhibit the pure Reformed system of doctrine. A very natural admission! Schweitzer's Reformed system they certainly do not exhibit. The old symbols, for the most part, are also far from the doctrines of absolute predestination in Calvin's sense. Besides, Schweitzer betrays great ignorance of the Reformed symbolics. 6) The citations he makes from the old Dogmas, express, for the most part, in their true connexion, a very different sense from that given to them by Schweitzer. He often grossly perverts their meaning by false interpretations. The most distinguished Dogmatics, such as Gisb. Voet, and the Commentators on the Cate-

chism, he *seldom* uses, and has *never* studied. He says very *naively* that he preferred small compends to large works. Thus it came, that he frequently interpreted the brief and less definite expressions of the smaller compends in such a way as to contradict the more accurate propositions of larger dogmatical works; and that he takes up precisely the apprehension which is there brought out as *false* and *objectionable*.

B. C. W.

ART. IV.—LAYING ON OF HANDS.

THE subject indicated by the above caption, is one which is frequently referred to, as we shall see more fully in the course of this article, in the Scriptures of Divine Revelation. That it is not more frequently dwelt upon and seriously regarded by the Church of the present age, is only another of the significant "signs of the times," which shows how far, and yet apparently, how unconsciously, we have traveled away from that true Church life by which we were once so peculiarly distinguished. This very fact should be sufficient to induce the most earnest and candid reflection in regard to it.

The *Laying on of Hands* may appear to some minds as a very small matter to be made the subject of an article in a grave literary and theological Review. We suggest, however, that all minds possessed of this tendency, allow themselves to study long, seriously and profoundly, before they permit a real judgment of this character to pass from them. It is not a trivial matter to judge in regard to the things of God: and remembering the natural tendency of the heart,

because of its sinful nature, to depreciate the things that are spiritual, and to magnify those that are carnal, we should be extremely careful, before we commit our feelings by any judgment, to ponder the subject seriously and deeply, just in the form in which it is presented by the Spirit in the word of divine truth. Upon spiritual things we are always disposed to look as through the microscope, which induces the sense of diminutiveness, whilst upon the world and carnal objects generally, we turn the telescope with its fullest power, and then exclaim—how great! how glorious!!

The smallest acts, according to our carnal judgment, are often, as we find in after experience, productive of the greatest results, both in relation to ourselves and others. The world, with all its acknowledged greatness, either in a physical or moral view, is the result of a single fiat on the part of the Almighty. "God spake, and it was done: God commanded and it stood fast." The eating of the forbidden fruit on the part of Eve, and the handing of it to her husband, who did likewise, was certainly, in itself considered, a very trivial and insignificant act, but as it stood related to the commandment of God which it violated, it was an act at once prolific of every evil both to body and soul, which has since afflicted the world. Where—when—will its dreadful power come to an end. And among the most potent agencies of recovering the mighty ruins of the fall, we are not directed to the fire, the earthquake or the storm, as emblems, but to the calm, quiet and soothing breeze—the type of the still small voice—the Spirit that from chaos produced the Cosmos with all its magnitude of proportion, harmony and beauty. "It is not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord."

When God's ordaining authority is interwoven with any ceremony, ordinance, or rite, then it is plainly not for the human mind to judge independently as to its importance or unimportance, as to its greatness or its insignificance; for, after all, it is and remains just what God has made it, and our judgment, for or against, can not affect or change

its objective character in the least, either one way or the other. It is a matter which lies wholly above and beyond us; and if a child-like piety which is the result of a true faith in Christ, be in our hearts and pervade our being, mental and moral, we shall gladly yield our carnal judgment in reference to all the institutions of God, and earnestly seek to regard them just in the light in which he has revealed them.

With this spirit we shall not regard any thing small, insignificant or unimportant, which is clearly the product of his ordaining power, especially as we know that God's peculiar plan is, by the weak things to confound those that are mighty.

The Laying on of Hands is indeed a small thing in itself considered, (and this is the only light in which we fear too many consider it) but connected, interwoven, as it evidently is, with the substantial system of redemption itself, we can have no authority, except in the case of a special divine grant, to look upon it as a thing of small moment. By the position and relations given to this rite by the uniform custom of those who acted under the direct inspiration of God, it evidently stands forth as an object of faith, just as every other fact growing out of the general system of grace, is an object of faith; and as such, we are of course exclusively dependent upon the Divine Word. We can properly have no thoughts of our own in regard to it, as it comes purely from God's ordaining grace, and must carry with it just the force which he designed it should carry; and what can we know in regard to the nature and object of a divine creature, or the spiritual power it may carry in it, except that, and that only, which God may see good to reveal to us, either in his word or through the creature itself? Just as he reveals it, so it is.

This being, in our view, the true form in which this rite meets us and challenges our regard, we shall now seek to direct attention, 1. *To the Biblical History of this rite*, and 2. *To its significance, or the doctrine which it involves for faith.*

I. The History of the rite. In regard to this point, we

may not expect of course to find facts in consecutive order, systematically connected and arranged, and fully developed at all points. The Bible presents no great doctrine in this form; it is rather like a widely extending and beautiful landscape, dotted all over with infinite variety, exhibiting indeed the same general growths in different localities, but always peculiarly modified, and never in the order of a scientific system. In this, as in all other respects, the Bible is unique—it stands alone in the free possession and clear evidence of its divinity.

The first intimation which we find of what afterwards became a general custom in the Church—the laying on of hands—is contained in the first book of the Bible. The rite has its origin in an early age—in times of comparative simplicity and purity—when God spake to man face to face, and when man lived in God. We love those days because of their spiritual, though simple associations, and feel sacredly attached to all the customs by which they were distinguished, because we know that amidst the child-like artlessness which then prevailed, there could have been nothing *formal*, as such, but that every thing was *real* and substantial.

Like a beautiful plant of affection, we find the rite growing up among the old patriarchs, whose rich spiritual fragrance was destined to descend to their children, and childrens' children to the end of time, that through all the successive ages, the eye beholding its simple beauty and the heart touched by its gentle power, might be turned back to the "days of old"—the simple days of their fathers.

The first great feeling which it is found to enshrine and represent, is the tender affection of a father for his child or children, which led him, especially at the end of his days, to invoke, in this impressive manner, the blessing of God upon them. In the 48th and 49th chapters of Genesis we have a touching and specific instance of this character, in the case of Jacob blessing his children and grand-children. In the case of Ephraim and Manasseh—the two

sons of Joseph—the *form* of this blessing is indicated very minutely: “And Israel stretched out his right hand, and laid it upon Ephraim’s head, who was the younger, and his left hand upon Manasseh’s, guiding his hands wittingly; for Manasseh was the first born.”

No one, with any degree of real sympathy with this age, on reading this simple account, can fail to be impressed with the peculiar care that was taken by the patriarch in regard to this form of blessing his children. To his mind there does not seem to have been any thing arbitrary about it. Each hand seemed to have contained its own peculiar blessing, and the whole, by father and children, was felt to be a solemn reality—a reality fixing destiny.

The same form was used also for other and different purposes. The Levites were required to lay their hands upon the animals which were to be slain as an offering for sin. (Num. 8 : 14.)

Hands were also laid upon individuals when they were set apart to a sacred office. Thus we read in the case of Moses, the divinely constituted leader of God’s people Israel, that, having been warned of his death before he should have conducted the sons of Jacob into the land of promise, he took Joshua, according to divine direction, and, setting him before Eleazar the priest and the whole congregation, “he laid his hands upon him, and gave him a charge, as the Lord commanded.” (Num. 27 : 18–23.)

Now in these respects, connected with some others, this rite is found to have been observed and practised during the whole period of the old dispensation.

In the New Economy the same form is observed from the very start. It was the habit of the Saviour, when parents, prompted by love to their children and faith in him, would bring their children to him that he should heal them, to lay his hands on them. (Matth. 19 : 15.) He did the same when they were brought simply to receive his blessing. It is said that “he laid his hands on them and departed thence.” (Matth. 19 : 15.) When he raised the daughter of Jairus from the dead, it is recorded that “He took the

damsel by the hand and said unto her, arise." (Matth. 5: 41.) Thus he illustrates his own declaration—"I came not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil." John, in the Apocalypse, speaking of the *last things*—the state of the Church and the glory of Christ at his second coming, says: "And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead; and he *laid his right hand upon me*, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last." (Rev. 1: 17.)

The Laying on of Hands was also the general form in which the Saviour and his apostles wrought miracles. When on a certain occasion, the Saviour 'could do no mighty works among the people because of their unbelief,' an exception is made in these significant words: "Save that he laid his hands on a few sick folk, and healed them." (Mark 6: 5.) While he was in the house of one Simon by name, after he had cured his wife's mother of a raging fever, and the evening having arrived, all those who had any sick in the whole community, brought them to him, it is stated that "he laid his hands on *every one of them*, and healed them. (Luke 4: 38-40.) Jesus having risen from the dead because it was not possible for him to be held by the grave, gave the same power to his apostles—aye, and even greater miracles than these shall ye do, because I go unto my Father. "And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall *lay hands on the sick*, and they shall recover." (Mark 16: 17, 18.)

It may be convenient for unbelief to confine all this to the apostles and their age, but we utterly fail to discover any Scripture reason for it. Following the great commission to preach the gospel and spread the ordinances of the kingdom throughout the whole world, these were the signs that were to follow in all time, evidencing the presence of Christ and the supernatural power of his kingdom.

Paul laid his hands on the father of Publius, who was seriously ill, and healed him, (Acts 28: 8); and Paul him-

self, after he had been stricken to the ground by the power of Christ and blinded by his glory, was restored to sight again by Ananias, through the laying on of his hands. (Acts 9: 12). And in the 5th chapter of Acts and 12th verse, it is thus emphatically declared: "And by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people."

The Laying on of Hands was also observed in the new dispensation in setting individuals apart to sacred offices. Saul and Barnabas were thus set apart, (Acts 13: 3); and thus also were Stephen, Philip, Prochorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas and Nicolas, the proselyte of Antioch, set apart and consecrated to a holy work. (Acts 6: 5, 6). Timothy was set apart in the same way, as we see from 1 Tim. 4: 14, and he, in turn, laid hands on others, and thereby imparted the same grace or gift. (1 Tim. 5: 22).

This was also the usual mode of communicating the Holy Ghost. The gift of the Holy Spirit was connected with that of sight, in the case of Saul, when Ananias laid hands upon him. He received his sight and the Holy Ghost. (Acts 9: 17.) Two remarkable passages occur in the 8th and 19th chapters of Acts. The first refers to some believers in Samaria, who had received the word of God, were baptized, and were leading outwardly correct Christian lives, but who had not yet received the Holy Ghost. Peter and John having been sent to them by the other apostles, laid their hands upon them, and they received the Spirit. The second refers to twelve persons at Ephesus, who had been gathered and baptized by John the Baptist. Paul meeting them, asked—"Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" They answered: "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." "Unto what then were ye baptized?" They answered, "Unto John's baptism." Here Paul explained to them the specific sense and design of John's baptism—as pointing to Christ—securing repentance and preparing the way for saving faith in his person. "When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus; and

when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with new tongues and prophesied."

Now this may suffice as a brief biblical history of this rite, to show the prominence in which it was held, and the purposes for which it was used. Many other instances might be referred to, but these are sufficient to show that the Laying on of Hands is a significant rite, running through the entire history of the Church, first under the old dispensation, and second under the new; and we are all familiar with the same form as it has come down to us, in all the different applications of it as presented in the sacred Scriptures.

Having said thus much in regard to the biblical history of this rite, we now turn,

II. To its significance, or the doctrine which it involves. That it has a spiritual meaning no one can reasonably doubt, seeing the divine circumstances under which it arose, the general and solemn uses to which it has been applied, and the consequences which have resulted from it.

It has a meaning already in the *natural* aspect of the case. There is a force or power in actual *contact*, which no simply moral affinities or sympathetic relations can possibly generate. To stand at the sick bed and lay your hands upon the fevered brow of the afflicted, is felt to be a great deal more than mere verbal sympathy, without real contact. A real hearty pressure of the hands, accompanied by genuine marks of interest in the countenance, carries with it more force than any words separately regarded, or than any interest manifested in any other way. There is more humanity about it; and in the case of the Christian, there is more Christian humanity.

There are forces connected with our nature which can not pass from us to others through wholly moral mediums, whilst these forces themselves are of a moral nature, and intimately connected with the life of religion and piety.

"None of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself." Our existence is not that of abstract isolation, each

one standing upon his own bottom, to work out the high end of his being the best way he can ; but it is that of organic connexion, by which we live in, and from, and by each other, and on the ground of which we are always affecting others, and in turn, being affected by them. Through the medium of this organic relation each to the other, there are thousands of influences passing, both when the mind is active and when it is passive, by which we are continually moulding the destinies of each other.

Christ was incarnated in human *flesh*—not in the human spirit simply—but in the flesh ; and a new life, a higher instinct, so to speak, and more spiritual powers have, in consequence, been wakened up within the more carnal part of our nature. These are constantly affecting us more or less even in our natural state ; for humanity generally has been placed in a substantially salvable state by the incarnation of Christ. But when these new forces are permitted to penetrate our persons actually through the exercise of a living faith in the Redeemer, or by a personal and higher contact with him as the gloriously constituted Saviour of the world, “our bodies”—in the strong language of Scripture—“become the temples of the Holy Ghost.” They become pervaded with a higher and a heavenly influence, which in turn is ready at all times to pass forth into others as soon as the necessary vital medium is formed by the association of congenial souls.

Contact—real contact, is not only the medium of electric influences, but also of that real spiritual communion, in which we express our faith, when we say, each for himself: “I believe in the communion of saints”—not of *spirits* only, but of saints, including body and soul.

We are so constituted that we can never witness the repetition of the old patriarchal rite without being deeply and solemnly impressed, even under its natural form. When we see the hoary headed sire, of the past generation, rising up and placing his hands upon the head of the little helpless one, saying in the act—God bless thee, my child—we instinctively feel that there is more signified in this, both

for the head and the heart, than could be expressed by an ordinary wish or prayer without the act.

Many persons—some now in the gospel ministry—have traced their earliest feelings of interest on the subject of religion, and their subsequent real change of nature, to prayers expressed in this form on the part of pious friends.

It was the touch of the Saviour's garment that cured the diseased woman in the crowd. "Somebody hath touched me," said Christ, "for I perceive that virtue hath passed from me." And it was the application of the Saviour's hand that brought back the spirit of the damsel who was lying in the cold embrace of death.

"Weep not," was the seemingly harsh injunction of Christ to a poor widowed woman as she was following the corpse of her only son to the grave, at Nain. But it was not cruel; for he meant to enable her to do with ease just what he had commanded her; and he moved quietly up to the bier, touched the lid of the coffin, and the young man revived, rose up to greet his Lord, and to dry the tears of his mother.

If we would really encourage the distressed and dispirited—if we would effectually disperse the heavy gloom of melancholy which is wont to settle upon souls of the finest texture—and if we would indeed throw the sunbeams of spiritual joy and gladness into their being, it will not do for us to stand off at a Pharisaical blue distance, and say: "Be of good cheer, friends," but we must approach them, identify ourselves with them, lay our hands upon their heads, wipe away the falling tear, and thus they will feel what neither they nor we can utter in the way of relief and comfort.

But to confine the significance of this rite wholly within any simply natural limits, would be, as we must all readily perceive, to contradict the whole spirit as well as letter of the Scriptures in regard to it. It involves more than the merely natural under any view. It is clearly a divine rite, and as such, carries with it, in addition to the natural, a divinely substantial force or power. The history of it, as

already presented, very conclusively establishes this, and does it in such a form that no mind can avoid seeing the fact.

It is the medium through which something spiritual is communicated. This something is variously denominated in the Scriptures. In some places it is called a "gift." In other places it is called "healing grace," "a blessing," the "Holy Ghost," and so on. In every case it is something of a spiritual order or nature, which was not possessed before; which shows the rite, not only to be a medium of grace, but also a *distinctive* medium, communicating *peculiar* grace.

This much is clear and patent upon its face: and yet the substantial force of the act is not to be regarded as in every instance precisely the same. It is not the same, nor yet is it at any time substantially different. When Christ laid his hands upon the little children and blessed them, it did not signify the same thing precisely as the "gift" communicated to Timothy by the laying on of the hands of Paul; and yet we would not say that the grace imparted by Christ to little children was less really grace than that which was communicated through Paul to Timothy. Still the children thus blessed, were not qualified by the blessing, to act in the same capacity, or to discharge the same duties with Timothy. There is a substantial sameness, and yet an official difference in the grace imparted, so that whilst the same hands are laid upon different persons, or even the same persons at different times, the inward effect is different.

It is not, therefore, a full and satisfactory explanation of this act, to say that thereby a gift is imparted. This is the great fact, to be sure, for our faith, but a fact which needs to be analyzed and thus understood in its different significations, in the case of different persons, or the same persons at different times and under different circumstances.

When an individual is confirmed, hands are laid on him, but he is not thereby qualified to act as elder in the Church; and when the same person is set apart as elder, or deacon,

by a repetition of the rite, he is not thereby qualified to act as minister. Though hands have been laid on him twice, and though he received a real gift each time, yet he is not a Timothy, nor is he qualified to discharge any function that belongs legitimately to the minister of Jesus Christ.

The Laying on of Hands implies, therefore, clearly a *grade of meaning*. It may be looked upon as the same grace *intrinsically*, looking to different ends *extrinsically*, to be accomplished in the kingdom of God, in which it holds. The life in the tree, produces first the leaf, then the bud, then the flower, and finally the fruit. Neither one of these is precisely of the nature of the other, but they are all produced by the same power pervading them. Thus it is with the grace imparted by this rite. It has its own ends within its own nature, to which it adapts itself with the readiness and precision of inspiration.

The Laying on of Hands is a divine act by which God solemnly claims for himself all upon whom the act has or may pass. This is no doubt its primary sense. To lay hands upon a thing is to set up a claim, and to say distinctly, "this is mine." It is the placing upon the object the seal of ownership. Thus God solemnly appropriates to himself and his service all those upon whom he commissions his servants to lay their hands in his name.

When we were received into the Church by confirmation, which was the completing act of our baptism, and therefore, although not a sacrament, still sacramental in its nature, we were thus claimed by the Almighty. From that hour we were no longer our own, but belonged to God. When we became elders by the same means, we were claimed in like manner for a definite sphere of Christian duty; and when by the same rite we were ordained to the holy office of the ministry, we felt that it was God's hand upon our heads, and God's voice saying—*ye are mine*. This claim on the part of God, sealed by his own sacred rite, can never, in its own nature, cease or change. We are his, in the particular sphere to which he has thus appropriated us, as long as we live and make his word the rule of our faith and conduct.

Moreover, we are qualified to discharge the duties of the station to which we are thus appointed through the same rite by which we are outwardly claimed for it and set apart to it. Through the same hands that seize hold of us thus in God's name, by which we are claimed as his, and led in to some department of Christian duty and responsibility, is communicated the inward and divine gift by which we become fitted to the station, whatever it may be. God never claims an individual outwardly for a position in his kingdom, to whom he does not impart the grace qualifying him to fill it agreeably to his will. Through the same hands by which God says, "thou art mine," he says at the same time, "and I am thine—thy grace, wisdom and strength—thine in every needed particular, in the fulfilment of your call and discharge of your official or other duties."

When Moses, by divine direction, constituted Joshua his successor by the laying on of hands, he became qualified in the very act to fill the office to which he had been called. It is thus recorded, "that Joshua, the son of Nun, was full of the spirit of wisdom"—Why?—"for Moses has laid his hands upon him." (Deut. 34 : 5.) Here, plainly, the laying on of hands is specifically referred to as the medium through which Joshua received grace adapting him to the position to which he had been called ; and this is the case always where there is genuine faith answering seriously to the outward call, and inducing a willingness and desire on the part of individuals, to be numbered with the divinely constituted agencies in accomplishing the great work of God in the world: and even where there lurks the presence of inward wickedness, unseen to the eye of the Church, preventing the entrance of the spiritual gift in its full divine power, still, even there, an official position is reached, rendering his acts, as such, valid and binding.

This qualifying grace received by the laying on of hands, always intensifies itself in proportion as the office is high, arduous and responsible. To all—as members of the Church—as deacons and elders—and as ministers—this

grace is given through this simple rite, qualifying each for the duty of his station, and assuring each, that, as his day is, so shall his strength be.

Now—this is what we regard as the great doctrine of this evidently divine though simple rite.

It finds its reality—not in any outward, formal and mechanical theory of divine succession, but in the true historical sense of the Holy Catholic Church, the mystical body of Christ, the real and perpetual bearer of his Spirit, grace and salvation to the children of men. The Church, as a divine organization, filled with divine and heavenly contents, permeated with the saving presence of the Holy Ghost, developing itself in a strictly historical way in the world, is enough of succession to meet all serious demands in regard to that point. This rite, holding in the life of this organization, can never be formal, as such, but must be substantially significant in all its applications; and it must be substantially significant at all times and in all localities; for the Church is ever and at all places substantially the same. Real progress is never eliminating so far as any real element of grace is concerned—never weakening—but, as in the case of natural growth, always strengthening, expanding—becoming more real and consolidated. The Church is the same now as it was in the days of the Apostles, making due allowance for its legitimate growth, or development; and the rite is used now just as and for the purposes it was then. Why, therefore, should it not signify the same? In the case of the believers at Samaria, and the twelve disciples at Ephesus, the laying on of hands was the *completion* of their baptism and the impartation of the Holy Ghost. Why should not Confirmation now be regarded in the same light? Why should not all entering the Church in this sacramental way, believe in the real presence of grace, qualifying them from that time forth, for every duty which may be legitimately required at their hands? Let the Church of Christ and her sacred rites stand out trembling with their own heavenly fullness and divine power, and we shall require nothing to effect the

greatest results, but the still small voice—the silent flow of grace through her regular ordinances, from him who is her centre and life—mighty to save—her all and in all—to whom be glory, world without end.

This whole subject, as now considered, has a direct and most practical application to all who bear upon them the Christian profession, and upon whom hands have been laid in the name of Christ.

It speaks to the ordinary membership of the Christian Church in a way that should excite the most serious reflection and vital concern. Hands have been laid upon them, by the appointment of Christ, when they first presented themselves at the altar to respond practically to the call of God and confess the name of his Son. They were then fully initiated into his great spiritual kingdom by the sacred rite of confirmation, and by it set apart to a holy sphere of activity and Christian duty, and received at the same time a gift or grace to qualify them to meet and satisfy properly every spiritual demand, whether arising from the Church, the family, or the world, which may be made upon them. Ability was imparted through this holy rite, which they are ever after bound to cultivate and increase, to shun the world under its sinful forms, to resist temptation, and to perform all those positive duties, in regard to themselves and their fellow-men, which are fairly implied in their solemn vows and required in the word of God. This grace imparted through the same divine rite by which they were claimed and sealed for God and the spiritual purposes in his Church, removes at once every ground of excuse arising from natural weakness, or from any unfavorable or opposing circumstances in which it may be their lot providentially to be placed. God is their strength, as in the case of Moses when he was called to undertake the leadership of his ancient people Israel, and this strength, thus received through his own holy rite, and which is increased by every subsequent and earnest effort to comply with the call of duty, is sacredly pledged to make them equal to all legitimate demands, and superior to all the trials which they may

meet, as followers of Jesus Christ. Recognizing the true inward significance of this holy rite, which is always as substantially real as their motives and purposes are pure and holy, their duty is to go forward, nerved spiritually with the sense of a divine commission, and depend at every step upon the grace of God, letting their light so shine before the world around them, that others, seeing the supernatural style of their character and spiritual results of their activity, may be induced likewise to glorify their Father which is in heaven. Thus the Church would show its divine attributes and resources, her members being "living epistles, read and known by all men."

Then, in a still higher sense and more sacred manner, if possible, does this whole subject address itself to the Elders and Deacons in the Church of Jesus Christ. Hands have been laid on them the second time; and by this they have been elevated to high and responsible offices. They have not in this second act, become officially exempted from the duties and privileges which were implied in the first. These continue to hold in all their original significance. The higher, in every legitimate process or gradation, always includes the lower; so that whilst the first act remains in all its force, they are, by the second, in addition to the first, set apart to, and qualified for, peculiar and distinctive duties. These duties are of a spiritual and sacred character, and are distinguished often by very slight shades from those which peculiarly belong to the ambassador of Jesus Christ. This is particularly so in the case of Elders, whose sphere is entirely and purely spiritual. In their office they stand almost side by side with the minister, and both have reference directly to the spiritual interests of the congregation over which they have thus sacredly been placed. Nor is it substantially different in the case of the Deacons. Although they are specially called to preside over the *temporal* concerns of the Church, yet these temporal concerns are not to be regarded as standing opposed to the higher and spiritual interests of the same. The poor are to be supplied with the necessities of the present life, but the duty which

makes this binding upon the deacons in their official character, is a spiritual duty, and not carnal. The mere fact that it brings money, &c., into view, does not, in any way, affect the office, as spiritual. It is the spiritual office seizing hold of the things of time, and applying them in a sacred way to the temporal necessities of God's people, with a view to comply with a divine command and to accomplish, through the receivers, a spiritual and holy purpose. The Elders and Deacons are the two official heads of the Church, so to speak, by which she meets the two-fold demand of her members arising from soul and body, both which she comprehends and sanctifies. The office of the Elder looks directly to the soul, whilst that of the Deacon looks to the soul indirectly, through the body. Both are purely spiritual in their nature, and both alike require a supernatural gift or grace to render them effectual in the benefits to which they have regard.

If these offices and office-bearers were to stand out now in their divine significance as they did in the earlier days of the Christian Church, as the bearers of heavenly blessings to men, and as the medium through which even the temporal things of the present life are made to carry a spiritual meaning and power, how differently would they be regarded, and how much greater and more healthful would be their general and specific influence! Then would they not be the mere nominal appendages to the Christian ministry, in the one case, and the mere drones in the Church of Christ, in the other, which they are now, alas, too often found to be; but the offices themselves would stand forth with the solemnity of the divinity, and authority by which they were instituted, and the office-bearers would realize a divine commission, which they would seek to carry out practically in the fear of God.

Finally: The subject as now discussed, appeals with special point and force to the Ministry. They are the Timothies to whom the Apostle speaks directly, putting them solemnly in remembrance, that they stir up the gift of God which is in them, which they have received by the putting

on of hands, in the sacred rite of ordination. (2 Tim. 1: 6.) The Apostle would have them to look definitely to this gift or grace, as constituting their central, specific and only spiritual qualification for the great work to which they have been called.

Learning is important—eloquence is important—a pleasing, winning address is important; but all these combined, brilliant, varied and profound as they may be, do not constitute the minister of Jesus Christ. No human endowments of the rarest character, though they may even vie with those of angels, and no human acquirements, however marvellous in their nature or extensive in their application, can possibly fit an individual for a divine office and spiritual functions. Nothing but the presence of the divine can do this; and this divine, not simply in the form of general piety, for piety never so great and undoubted, makes no man a minister of Christ in the official and full sense of that term; but the divine, under a specific form, as this is imparted by the laying on of hands, in the name of Jesus Christ. This power raises the man beyond his mere individual life, and places him in a divine office, thus making him an *officer* in the kingdom of God in the world. This involves more, in every sphere, than the mere individual. The acts of a civil officer, as such, comprehend always far more than the acts simply of the individual. They carry with them a general authority, which can not be resisted or trampled upon in any way with impunity. One such individual may have more power than the whole nation besides; for he is the representative and executor of the nation, to whom this power has been officially delegated. Now it is difficult to conceive how we can have any other views of the officers legitimately appointed in the kingdom of God, unless our faith be of such an indifferent character, as to lead us to regard the kingdom of God in the world, as existing only in the way of name or appearance, comprehending and bearing with it no divine significance and supernatural power. And yet we are every where taught that no form of authority is so real and sub-

stantially founded as that of Christ and his kingdom. It is the basis of all other orders of power and influence. "All power"—said Christ just before he left the world—"All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, *therefore*, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (Matth. 28: 18, 19, 20.) Here is the presence of a great kingdom, with Christ as its centre, comprehending all power in heaven and on earth, commissioning his servants to go forth and act in his name and by his power, bearing in their own persons officially, authority to teach and communicate, through his own ordinances, the grace of spiritual life and salvation. As the officers in this kingdom and acting in the legitimate fulfilment of their assigned duty, ministers have an authority which is felt both in heaven and on earth. When they preach, they do it in this character, having a message from God; when they baptize or administer the holy sacrament of the Supper, they do it as those vested with this divine authority; when, by the order of Christ and in imitation of the example of the early Church, they lay their hands upon the heads of men, whether in confirmation or ordination, they do it in the name of the Great Head of this kingdom, Jesus Christ, and they are bound to believe that He, through them, communicates the grace which the acts themselves, by divine arrangement, are made to adumbrate in the way of outward type. When all these officers, in their official capacity, act together in the name of Christ and of His kingdom, the result is to be regarded as that flowing from the efficient judgment of Christ himself; for what is thus bound on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and what is loosed on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.

This is the deep significance of the officer in the kingdom of Christ, especially of the ambassador who, in a peculiar sense, being the highest, stands in the place of Christ, laboring in his stead; and this peculiar significance

is imparted through the laying on of hands. This is the power which is weak and despicable in the eyes of the world, but sublime in the estimation of God, by which he confounds those that are regarded as mighty. This is the grace borne and exhibited in earthen vessels, and communicated by an apparently insignificant rite, in order that the power and the glory of it may be of God and not of man. The more thus inward, spiritual and altogether gracious qualification in the minister of Christ is looked to and depended on, in vital connection with the regular ordinances of the "Church which is His Body," the more deeply spiritual will be the piety among men, and the more true and lasting will be the prosperity of Zion. What a deeply humiliating effect this true view of the case would have upon the minister at the altar! How it would prevent that swelling of pride, because, perhaps, of the possession of eloquence or learning, or the graces of a pleasing and captivating address! While it would impart to the men of God true and solid dignity, how radically would it sweep away every cause which leads so many to glory in the flesh—in the power which they may wield as individuals, and in the effects which they are able to produce by agencies foreign to those which have been divinely appointed! How different would be the attributes of excellence by which he would be distinguished and esteemed! and how much more divinely glorious would be the results of his labors! Ministers in connection with the ordinances of the Church would be the divinely constituted organs through which God in Christ by the Holy Ghost would reconcile men to Himself, and the whole work and effect, from beginning to end, would be spiritual and divine.

D. G.

ART. V.—THE LORD'S SUPPER.

A Disputation concerning the Lord's Supper, by ANTHONY THYRIUS, Doctor and Professor of Theology in the University of Leyden.—A. D., 1724.

Discrepancy with regard to the Lord's Supper evidently prevails, even among those in the Reformed Church, whose Fathers harmonized on that subject, and were termed by their opponents sacramentarians, because of the significance they attached to it. Without entering into controversy, truth could not, perhaps, be better subserved than by inviting attention to what obtained more than a century ago. Comparison may determine that, to a certain extent, ancient landmarks have been lost sight of, and thus facilitate that happy agreement and Christian unity, which once characterized the Reformed in France and Switzerland, in Germany and Holland, in Europe and America. What could be more desirable, in the present period of alienation, so rampant from various causes throughout our land, sundering North and South, East and West, embroiling, in some instances, those of the same household of faith? And, is it not attainable? Who does not devoutly pray that these divisions, these bleeding, dangerous wounds in the body of Christ, may be speedily and soundly healed—that we may be “perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment?”

For that end, without adopting the mode usually pursued by a reviewer, further preliminary apart, a careful, and, what on the whole, will be found to be a correct, although from that very circumstance, a somewhat inelegant translation, pertaining to the subject matter, is respectfully submitted.

Lancaster, Pa.

I. S. D.

A DISPUTATION CONCERNING THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Baptism, the sacrament of regeneration, repentance, faith, and, therefore, of the putting on of Christ and of initiation, having been examined, we next come to *the Lord's Supper*, the sacrament of nutrition, and, as the Fathers termed it, the Mystery of perfection.

Scriptures and the Fathers assign it various appellations.

It is called in Scripture: 1. *the Lord's Supper* (1 Cor. 11: 20)—from the circumstance of time, since it was an evening feast—and from its author and design, having been instituted by the Lord that he might be remembered—an end absurdly restricted by the Jesuits to the love-feasts: 2. *the Lord's table*, (1 Cor. 10: 21,) and, absolutely, *table* (Acts 6: 2) by metonymy used for this sacred feast. Yet it seems these (1 Cor. 10: 21), however, are to be referred to the bread, since the cup of the Lord is also mentioned: 3. The bread which is broken, and the cup of blessing (1 Cor. 10: 16): 4. This bread and this cup of the Lord, and absolutely, bread and cup (1 Cor. 11: 27, 28): 5. Bread (1 Cor. 10: 17) and also drink, agreeably to the derivation of the word (1 Cor. 12: 13) by synecdoche: 6. Meat and drink, spiritual (1 Cor. 10: 3, 4): 7. breaking of bread (Acts 2: 42 and 20: 7). The phrase sometimes signifies any domestic feast among the Jews, but here that which is not common: 8. the Lord's body (1 Cor. 11: 39) by metonymy: 9, and in fine, feast of charity (2 Peter 2: 13. Jude 12), that is, a sacred feast instituted to testify and preserve love and to comprehend this sacrament as its most important part.

It is, moreover, called, particularly by the Grecian Fathers: 1. *συναγῆς*, *coming together*, since it was wont to be celebrated in the assemblies of the church (Acts 20: 7 and 1 Cor. 11: 18–32): 2. *Εὐχαριστία*, *giving thanks*, or *Εὐλογία*, *blessing*, doubtless from the previous action of Christ and its design—done and ordered to be done by Christ with a solemn act of thanks for his death and its benefits (1 Cor. 10: 16. Matth. 26: 26, 27): 3. *κοινωνία*, *communion* or *communication*, from Paul, who attributes to the bread and wine the appellation of the communion and participation of the

body and blood of Christ (1 Cor. 10: 16, 17, 21): 4. Προσφορά, *oblation* or *that which has been presented*, from the bringing of the bread and wine by the faithful (believing) people for the celebration of the Agape and Eucharist to the bishop, who, in turn, restored the offering to the communicating people, (the former was called δωρον, the latter, αντιδωρον); it was also wont to be offered to God by the whole Church with an act of praise and thanks; but not as if an offering was made of Christ crucified by the priests to God, except by way of trope: 5. Θυσία, *sacrifice* or *victim*, but improperly, as it appears from the prayers and giving of thanks, as also from its being the commemoration of the one expiatory sacrifice once offered for us on the cross; not properly as Romanists contend, for a eucharist and also for an expiation of sins which they nevertheless affirm to be bloodless. The ancients indicated this sacred rite by other names, but for the most part, the above are their descriptions, commendations and epithets of so great a mystery.

It is, moreover, called Λειτουργία, or from λειτουργός, *pertaining* to the people, universally denoting a *public*, and in the church a sacred *function*, or transaction, by which is signified the entire sacred service of the divine word, but particularly the administration of the Lord's Supper, (λειτουργούντες accordingly, denotes not sacrificing, as Erasmus has rendered it, Acts 14; but attending to sacred things, as he himself elsewhere interprets it). By some it is more especially called τερπουργία, or *service of sacred things*, which also is metaphorically employed relative to the preaching of the gospel. (Rom. 15: 16.)

Among the Latins it began to be called Mass, about four hundred years after Christ—not, as some, without reason, affirm after Reuchlin and Genebrard, from the Hebrew MAS tribute, whence MISSA, (Deut. 16: 10) that is, *offering*, as in the first verse of that chapter, or *substitute* (sufficientia), as the Seventy translate it, which rather would take its name from MASSA, relating to the tempting of God—nor, from the adjective feminine Missa, an offering to God, as Pontificians commonly assert—but, from the sub-

stantive Missa, used instead of missio, as collecta, oblata, remissa and the like, were used in the age of Tertullian for collectio, oblatio, remissio. It is so called, either from the sending (missione) of the things offered by the faithful, or from the beginning of the celebration of the mysteries which was made by the dismissal (missa for missione) of the Catechumens and Penitents, or from the close, (the sacred things having been attended to), when a missa (missio) dismissal was made to the faithful, that they might depart, with this solemn form, *Ite missa est*, that is, missio est, it is dismissal. It is also called in a more deteriorated age, the Sacrament of the altar, which appellation Luther even, for what reason I am ignorant, thought he ought to continue.

Moreover, the Lord's Supper is the other sacrament pertaining to spiritual nutrition, of the new covenant or testament, instituted by Christ our Lord for the faithful, by which with broken bread and effused wine, Christ, as having suffered and died, or his broken body and shed blood for the remission of sins, is signified, and by their participation and communion, is offered for spiritual food and drink to the recipients and given to the faithful. It must be used for the remembrance of Christ with the showing forth of his death, and for union and communion with Christ, the head over the true mystic body—redounding to the glory of the grace of God and to the greater certainty of eternal life for the faithful.

The efficient cause of the institution is, unquestionably, the Lord Jesus, author of the new covenant of grace and mediator and testator of the new Testament, and therefore the sole institutor of the symbol. For that is an act of the greatest power, and it is his prerogative to add the signs of grace to whom it belongs to give grace, and to show and effect that which the signs exhibit and promise; but that which pertains to a servant of Christ is to deliver to the Church, and preserve faultless what he has received from the Lord, faithfully, without diminution, addition, or any alteration (Matth. 28 : 20. 1 Cor. 11 : 23).

The efficient cause of the exhibition is properly the same Christ who indeed first through himself by his own authority exhibits the symbols, and afterward through the ministers of his word, with whom he is present and whom he commissioned. The above is external, but internally, through the Holy Spirit, he conveys to the faithful the very thing.

The Lord Jesus, founder of this sacred feast, instituted and exhibited it the night in which he was betrayed, the Sabbath evening of the sixth day or the first of the paschal week of unleavened bread, according to the custom of the Jews, beginning the day from the evening, that by this circumstance of time he might the more commend the supper to "his own," and so by this last supper establish a monument of the covenant and testament about to be ratified by death:—and as to the place, in the city of Jerusalem, in a large upper room and upon a great table spread and made ready, where the Passover also was prepared.

And indeed it was instituted and exhibited *after he had supped* (Luke 22 : 20) the legal supper of the Paschal lamb with his disciples—not according to Jewish tradition, but the command of the law concerning it. (Mark 14 : 12. Luke 22 : 7.) This legal supper was the type of Christ, (1 Cor. 5 : 7,) and, under the remembrance of deliverance out of Egypt, was designating the spirit and antitype of this Lord's Supper, inasmuch as it was that which also was designed to point to that Lamb of God (1 Cor. 5 : 7). It was thus purposely arranged that the completion of the old sacrament might be indicated by the succession of the new. With respect to that Christ says: "With desire have I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer."

Nay more, as many desire, it was instituted and exhibited with a previous *washing of feet*. For Supper having been ended (John 13 : 2), rising from supper (4), he washed the feet of "his own," according to the oriental custom (Luke 7 : 44), that by his own act and example he might precede them in humility and love and testify his benevolence to "his own," that he truly was the one who washes "his own" from their defilements (John 13 : 8, 9, 10, 14)

and by a similitude, not by a sacrament, teach them what manner of persons it became them to be to approach these holy rites. The occidental Church, notwithstanding, here used that washing, apart from the Supper, and sometimes not without abuse, for a sacrament.

It was besides instituted and exhibited by Christ, *sitting down again or reclining* (John 13: 12), after the manner then in vogue among the people of God, since it was their custom to take their food, not sitting, but reclining on small lounges, their heads arranged within, but their feet without, so that they who followed could commonly recline on the bosoms of those who preceded, (John 13: 23, 25), that a feast might be signified, not a sacrifice, as Pontificians would have it, who here introduced altars by an unwarrantable imitation that is Jewish and Gentile; for a sacrifice would have gone standing to the altar.

And indeed, as an ancient interpreter judges, it was instituted and exhibited with the twelve disciples or apostles then eating or supping the supper that was common and much used, to indicate a public feast, not a private repast. It was connected with the rite of the breaking of bread and the blessing of the wine, for the remembrance of their redemption out of Egypt (Luke 22: 18) as is clear from the ritual books of the Jews, which, as well as the usual washings in baptism, the Agape and this Supper of the Lord would appear to have succeeded.

Christ, therefore, then prepared that supper for his own guests, *the apostles*, and in their person for all the faithful, since the apostle supposes the existence of faith. For what was done relating to the apostles, the apostle afterward referred not only to the pastors but also to the rest of the Church (1 Cor. 11); and they themselves here have the position not of administering but receiving. The supper is, therefore, for those who are in a state of piety, as far as men can judge, secret things being left to God, but not for catechumens who have not been baptized, nor for backsliders, or for those accounted among the repenting. Whence the apostle says, "let each one examine himself."

And this enjoined individual examination does not permit the supper to be withheld from any pastor or any one belonging to the Church. And whether the traitor Judas was present at the supper or not, may be inquired out of Matthew and Mark compared with Luke and John.

Nevertheless, neither the circumstance of time, evening or night, or of the sixth day of the week, or of the anniversary, the third day before the resurrection—nor the circumstance of place that was private—nor also that the supper was administered to those who supped, reclining, their feet having been washed, and twelve in number (some of which peculiarities obtained for a time in the primitive Church)—no one of these imposes a rule necessary to be observed.

And these were the preambles of the Lord's Supper. Itself wholly consists in the mystic *doings* and *sayings* of Christ, and in the *obedience* of the disciples, of the faithful, suitably answering these sayings and doings and in the *giving of thanks* that followed. The causes of the mystery are comprised in these particulars.

Among the *sacramental deeds* of Christ, pendent upon his institution and entire action, and so performed that they might strike the senses—be done by sensual things and announce something spiritual to the mind, is, First, (what was set before the eyes of the apostles) *λαβων*, that is, bread having been taken (*accepta pane*) or, when he had taken bread (*quum accepisset panem*), and afterward the cup into his hands after the manner of the father of a household. Here we have the beginning of the institution and its performance, and especially the act of setting apart for a particular use. And what is more, by taking them into his hands he gave us a sign of his voluntary death—since to take, put, have, carry, bear one's self in life is, by Hebraism, to encounter or undergo extreme danger to life (Judg. 12: 8. 1 Sam. 19: 5, and 28: 21. Job 13: 14. Psalms 119: 109).

The *external matter* of this mystery consists, moreover, in these very representations that were taken, which are in-

deed two and diverse, but not truly and properly two Sacraments (as some of the ancients are wont to speak) since they concur to one end, a complete sacred feast and refection. He, therefore, took them separately—that he might signify his bloodless body and his blood, as if then poured forth without the veins—and that he might testify his whole self to be aliment and refection for us. (John 6 : 53, etc.)

Whence truly Papists most seriously violate the integrity of the sacrament, and in that matter are sacrilegious, since they withhold the cup, the other part of the sacrament, from the faithful Laity, under some pretext of human prudence and of concomitance, and respect for the glorious body. Such violation is mere outrage against the Lord. It is contrary to the act and order of Christ, (Luke 22 : 19. 1 Cor. 11 : 25,) to apostolic practice, (1 Cor. 11 : 26, 27, 29,) to all antiquity, and to the universal Church of God every where, except the recent one of Rome.

Besides, he used true, household bread, flat and not thick in form and suitable on that account for breaking, as the custom of that people prescribed ; entire and one, moreover, unleavened or unfermented, from mere accident on account of the legal circumstance of the first day of unleavened bread. Otherwise, he would have used what was common. Accordingly, Christ (John 6) takes a similitude from common bread, and the apostle speaking of the Supper merely makes mention of such bread as was used by the Corinthians—unleavened bread having been abolished along with the Paschal lamb and the rest of the ceremonies. In other respects, if you disallow the necessity of that which is unleavened, it is truly a matter of indifference. Vain, therefore, the contention between the Grecians and the Latins about this thing.

In like manner he used drink from the product (genuine), or fruit of the vine, (Matth. 26 : 29) that is, wine ; but, whether reddish, such as pertains to that region, (Prov. 23 : 31, whence also it is called the blood of the grape, Gen. 49 : 11), or diluted, which is called a mixture, from a custom in those warmer places of tempering the wine (Prov.

9: 25 and 23: 30)—is doubtful. Justinus declares that the cup which was used was tempered with water and wine. Nevertheless, as to religion and mystery that can be of no moment, and the same assertion may be made with regard to the form of the cup, whether a chalice or not, and of its material, whether it should be wood, or silver, or gold.

The reason he took bread and wine—common articles and selected from what was present among them (*demedio*), for mysteries is, on account of the striking similitude and analogy of the properties and effects of each, since they are primary elements and eminently necessary for nutrition and thus truly suitable for the things signified, the body and blood of the Lord.

Whence certainly the Pontificians, and others, emulous of them, sin not lightly who use bread that is not bread, that is, morsels, mere little substitutes (*nummularis* ?), of most attenuated form and shadowy lightness, undeserving of that name and destitute of nutritious power, being wafers (*obliis* ?) or hosts (*oblatis* ?) as they call them: and also unfermented, as if necessary to the sacrament, pleading the example of Christ. They also sin because they use diluted wine for the sake of mystery—with regard to which, certain ancients, as Cyprian and others, too subtilely philosophized.

If, however, there should be a place where bread and wine are not in use, or where a supply (*copia*) cannot be had, that may be taken which answers to bread and wine, and is analogous to them among that people.

The *second deed* of Christ, (which was perceptible to the ears of the apostles) is his address to God contained in the *Eυλογησας, και* being understood, which is expressed by Mark and Luke, answering to, *and when he had blessed*, as Matthew and Mark have it in the former clause, but in the latter about the cup *Ευχαριστησας*, that is, *when he had given thanks*, which with Luke and Paul is in both clauses, so that they may be promiscuously used and must be in this place, unless we would maintain the bread only and not the cup, to have been consecrated. So they are elsewhere taken for the

same in a common feast (Matth. 14: 19 and 15: 36. Mark 6: 40 and 8: 6. Luke 9: 16. John 6: 11 and 23. Acts 27: 35.) So also the Hebrew words BORECH, that is, blessed, wished well, and IODHA, confessed, praised, celebrated, gave thanks, are mutually interchanged. You must have understood, *looking up to heaven*, which gesture of praying was elsewhere used by Christ (Matth. 14: 19); and that too, *before all* (Acts 27: 35) *he gave thanks or blessed* God the Father, as it is there (Rom. 14: 6). The same address was used—when particular reference was made to bread and wine as gifts of the divine beneficence—and when more especially it related to the benefit of Redemption.

And more than that—by the term of giving of thanks, that is of invocation and supplication, this entire sacred operation, and, therefore, the consecration itself, of which that is only a part, is synecdochically understood. Yea, the language of blessing—with the fourth case of the subject—related in common to the bread and wine (the like phrase of which is in Luke 9: 16) the more strongly indicates that. By this language—these things, which were ordinary and common provisions for the body, sanctified by the word of God and prayer that they might be holily used by the faithful (which is done when they are taken from the liberal hand of God, holily and soberly enjoyed and made to refer to the glory of God, 1 Tim, 4: 3, 4, 5. 1 Cor. 10, 31), the Son of God prepared, designed, appointed, dedicated, or sanctified and consecrated, moreover to a sacred end and spiritual function, to serve for nutriment to the soul—that they might be the mystic symbols of his body and blood: not by a change of nature but of condition, made by the divine institute and ordination of him who operated, and by solemn prayer and right use. So the language of blessing in relation to subjects is generally taken (Gen. 2: 3). In this sense it is said by the apostle, *the cup of blessing which we bless* (1 Cor. 10: 16).

But, what form of blessing and giving of thanks Christ here used is not disclosed. Yet he accommodated the usual

body. Whence by a metonymic change of words in both the breaking is ascribed to the body and shedding to the blood.

Wherefore Romanists and those who follow them in the distribution of the Eucharist, giving something entire in their little round wafers, have truly taken away, not without a violation of the sacrament, the rite of the breaking (of bread) thence from Christ and the apostles (1 Cor. 10: 17) continued in the primitive Church, as well as maintained among the orientals: that only having been retained by the Priests in their sacrifice of the Mass. Even Lutherans, who please themselves with the idea that to break, here means distribute, give an absurd interpretation, since it immediately follows, *and he gave unto them.*

The fourth deed (which relates to the touch) is, *and he gave to his disciples.* For he had taken and broken, that he might give, that is, he offered, he presented, both the bread and the cup to the hands, not the mouth, of his disciples. For food is not immediately conveyed to the mouth, save of the impotent. Receiving answers to this giving; and the apostle (1 Cor. 11) includes the omitted giving. And here the apostles occupy the place, not of pastors, but of the whole Church, since Christ is said to have given to them all: otherwise, if it is spoken with reference to the apostles alone, by what right has the Lord's Supper been made common to all?

Moreover, by this giving it is declared, that all sacraments, and therefore, this one, consist not only in their signification, but also in their application and use, and that by these sacred signs Christ is presented and given by God to be received and conferred by faith. But whilst he is said to have given to them, he thereby offered no sacrifice, for that is to give to God.

Whence it is truly manifest, that the sacrilege of Pontificians in the Mass is great, to feed the faithful by nothing more than a beholding of the bread and wine, which the Mass makers allow to themselves alone, and so make private what was instituted for the whole Church: Yea, verily, it is also idolatrous to elevate these for adoration.

To his deeds Christ also enjoined his *words* to the apostles, which are *προσαστα*, that is, *preceptive*, *οπιστα*, that is, *indicative*, as also *νομοθετα*, *legislative*, fixing the law, for all Christianity in every age, and declaring the use and the end, of this sacrament.

And he said (which pertains to the ears) to his disciples, is firstly spoken in general, as to the things that followed, by which the design of his acting might become known. For sacraments and sacramental actions, inasmuch as they grow out of the design, would be representations altogether insignificant and useless, unless connected. But he spoke intelligently, openly and clearly, using language not foreign but paternal and customary, that these things might be understood and perceived by all. In another respect this muttering would have been to no purpose. Indeed, the voice of speaking—having relation to the mandate that followed, according to the Hebrew idiom, especially avails the same thing as he ordered, he proclaimed.

Therefore, Papists, who, after the manner of magicians and charmers, mutter these words, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*, towards the bread and cup—that are insensible creatures and incapable of being spoken to—and utter these silently and in an unknown tongue, contrary to the apostle (1 Cor. 14: 6, &c.), do any thing rather than perform this sacred mystery.

In the next place he orders (what regards the touch) *Take*—including them all—both this bread and this cup which I hold in my hand and give you into your hands—not likewise by the mouth. Because the propriety of the word *take* necessarily requires the receiving of the thing offered with the hand, just as *eat*, *drink*, relate to that receiving which is made by the mouth. Besides the method of putting into the mouth is not suitable for adults—nor the form of reclining, by which he could not conveniently come to the mouths of those lying around in a circle. It is not accordant with the practice of the ancient Church, nor of the modern, out of the Roman. But it is not a sacrifice, since they were offered to be received by the apostles and were

not offered to God. And yet in this command made to the faithful about taking, is as it were, the conveying of Christ into the power of the hands and also the perception of Christ by faith, which is the hand of the soul. (John 1: 11, 12.)

Therefore Papalists do superstitiously, who introduce private masses, when the sacrificer standing by the altar alone eats and drinks—in opposition to Christ and antiquity. As also they papalize with them who deny to the hands of the faithful what they put to their mouth: as if the hands are more impure than the mouth, which are in the faithful equally sanctified (Matth. 15: 18. James 3: 10): and, as if the hands of those who administer were purer than those of the rest of the Church. They thus very much obscure the operation of faith. Moreover whilst they determine it is a sacrifice, what else is that than not to distinguish between to give and receive?

Afterward he says, (what concerns the smell and taste) *eat and drink ye all of it*—that is to say, he commanded them to take that they might eat the bread and drink the wine. The sense is, put it in the mouth, chew, masticate and mash it with the teeth; and put the cup to the mouth, drink the wine and commit them to the stomach for digestion and nourishment. By this their innermost use is designed and signified—that Christ, to believing souls, or those receiving him by faith, as by a hand, and as it were, eating and drinking him in their mouth (which metaphor the Holy Spirit uses in different places, John 4: 14 and 6: 51, 53), serves for spiritual and heavenly meat and drink, as truly as that on which we feed serves to nourish, cherish, strengthen and increase the body.

Besides, all these plurals, *take, eat, drink*, and expressly of the cup *drink ye all of it*, which analogically also is to be understood of the bread, except that that which is spoken of the bread as it is divided, is spoken of the cup as one which allows no division except according to each one's draught, by the common command, denote equal communion of each element, and not the private, but the public necessity of the receiving of each, and expressly of the cup.

This bread, therefore, contrary to the use divinely prescribed, and the ancient Church, is not to be elevated for adoration, as if it were some divinity, to be included in a bowl (*ciborio* ?), to be kept in a chest or a small idolatrous closet, among shows (*Monstratiis* ?) as they call them, made of gold and silver to be exhibited, and to be publicly carried about in parades, after the Persian manner, or conveyed around the fields, as Papalists do. Moreover, private masses, one apart by himself devouring, and the withholding of the cup from the Laity, and the conveyance of its benefit even to the dead, to whom it belongs not to eat or drink—are so many abuses and profanations of the Lord's Supper.

The obedience of the disciples responds and succeeds to this command, in the taking of the bread and wine, as well as in their assumption or eating and drinking, which is included in the command, and Mark shows in the cup, when he says, *they all drank of it*, which in like manner is to be understood of the bread, that there the taking implies the command of drinking. And these words Mark relates as spoken before those, *This is the blood of the New Testament*, &c., but that is not unusual that mystic actions should be performed before it is understood or explained what they mean, as we see was done in the washing of feet. (John 13: 4, 12.) Whatever it is, whether the order of the words is here right, or a hystorology is in them, matters little or nothing as to the subject matter.

Subjoined to these words of Christ, are those that are *οπισθεν* indicative, or declaring and defining the thing signified, and the promise added to the external symbols, in which is the internal matter of the Lord's Supper, when he says, *This is my body*, to which Luke adds, *which is given for you*, and Paul, *which is broken for you*: and to *this* (hoc or hic) (for which Luke has *this cup*, and also Paul) Matthew adds, *for*, which also is understood in the preceding clause, *my blood of the New Testament*, or, as Luke and Paul, *the New Testament in my blood*. Matthew and Mark add, *which for many*, Luke has it, *for you*, is shed; Matthew, besides, *for the remission of sins*.

By the above deeds and orders, whilst he was taking that bread and cup—the one broken but the other poured out and was offering them to be taken and received by the disciples, is declared what mystery Christ would have intended by the external elements and actions, that is, what other thing is to be considered by the mind and faith—that his broken body and shed blood are to be taken and received for spiritual food and drink. So that the sense is, as if it had been in so many words enunciated. This bread, which I have broken, is my broken body, and the cup or that which is in the cup is my shed blood, and so what I have given you and ye are commanded to take, to eat and drink, is to give and take, to eat and drink my body and blood.

These words, moreover, because they may be obscured by various interpretations, some, hence, extracting *συνουσιας*, consubstantiation, others, *μετουσιας*, transubstantiation, are to be the more carefully considered as to the simple truth which they assert. And first, *the subject* of that which is enunciated, that is, *this*, then, that which is the predicate, namely *the body and blood* and what is declared of each; thirdly, the copula or chain, *is*; fourthly, *the whole enunciation*; lastly, the ratiocinative particle, *for*, and the connexion of these words with the preceding.

The subject, therefore, is *τοῦτο*, *this*, a demonstrative adjective; which marks the thing, as truly existing and present, as if with a pointed finger; of the neuter gender which requires a substantive to which it is related, and often has one adjoined, as *this passover*, *this fruit of the vine*. (Matth. 26.) But since *οὗτος* is not spoken with the former member relating to bread, (*panis*), but *τοῦτο*—it can be rendered in each member, *τοῦτο*, *is my flesh* or *body*, and *τοῦτο*, *is my blood*. For as the Greeks and Latins put neuters absolutely, so also do the Hebrews feminines, and after the manner of demonstratives, as for instance, what would be expressed in Latin, *haec res*. And it chiefly has this use since besides being demonstrative, it is also a relative to the antecedent noun or fact, as Ex. 8: 18, *this is the finger of God*. 1 Pet. 2: 19.

This is the grace of God, (Luke 22 : 17,) Take this, and 19, Do this—the neuter *rovro*, being used in each instance ; or they refer *suppositum*, *ad oppositum*, in the same gender, as grammarians say, as also the Hebrews do. Virgil, *sed revocare gradum, &c., hoc opus, hic labor est*; (John 17,) to know the only true God, *haec vita aeterna est*. So also it can be said, *hoc est corpus meum, hic est sanguis meus*. The Hebrews also here use often, in place of a demonstrative pronoun a demonstrative adverb, *HEN* and *HINNE*, that is *lo* and *behold*. So Paul, (Heb. 9 : 20), interprets that of Moses, (Ex. 24 : 8., Behold the blood of the covenant.) This is the blood of the testament. So (John 19), Behold thy mother, behold thy son, that is, this (Mary) is thy mother, this (John) is thy son.

Therefore, *rovro*, (this in the neuter) signifies the same as *haec res*, (this thing expressed by the Latins in the feminine) of which mention was before made, that is to say, *hic panis* and *hoc vinum*, this bread and this wine—the *hic* and the *hoc*, or the *this* and *this* having relation to the bread and wine and serving to indicate them as with a pointed finger. For at the very first Luke and the apostle expressly say, *hoc poculum*, this cup, so nevertheless that the containing is used for the contained, after a manner of speaking trite and common in all languages ; for it is said, Drink ye all of it, and I will not drink of the fruit of the vine.

Hence that is understood which Jesus took into his hands, blessed, with an accusative case, Hebraically, broke, gave to the disciples, and which he ordered to be taken and imbibed : but that was bread and wine ; as grammatic construction facts. For all those verbs are of transitive signification, demand the fourth case and produce that which in that place is not another. Fixed logical reason accedes. The proposition is, ye ought to eat and drink *this*, in the fourth case, that is, the bread and wine, (*panem et vinum*), because *this* is my body and blood. Otherwise, the ratiocination which is indicated by the particle *for*, could not be proper, if it might be referred to any thing else, nor could

there be a connexion of the terms. Finally, Paul (1 Cor. 10), takes away all controversy whilst he says, The bread which we break and the cup of blessing which we bless, *is* it not the communion of the body and blood of Christ, for we being many are one bread, one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread, and (1 Cor. 11), as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup. By these passages it is evinced that bread and wine, and indeed true bread and wine, are pointed out by the demonstrations *hoc et hic*.*

It is foolish, therefore, because it is not *οὗτος*, but *τοῦτο*, to refer that, as Carolstadt imagined, to *σῶμα*, the body reclining at the table and which the apostles were perceiving with their eyes, since it is afterward said, This cup is the New Testament, &c. This would be nothing else than to overthrow the reason (*rationem*), peculiar to a subject or sacrament. In like manner, it is a perversion of the terms, because of the article *το*, added to *σῶμα*, which marks the subject (as John 1: 1, *θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος* and 4: 16, *πνεῦμα ὁ θεός*), so to construct the words with Swenkfeld, *my body is this*, that is to say, what the bread broken and eaten up is, or, in other words, spiritual and heavenly meat—so that it does not point to the external bread, nor does it show what the bread is, but what the body of Christ is, which construction this passage of John 6, serves to strengthen, the bread which I will give unto you is my flesh, and my flesh is meat indeed, &c. For the article *τοῦτο*, includes the bread, and in the following member of the sentence, it is, *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον*, *this cup*, with the article *το*. But in John the word bread is to be metaphorically taken. Yet we deny not that even here in the word bread, a metaphor is comprehended, although not immediately; and in truth these propositions are reciprocal.

Neither, as Thomas wills, is to be understood with Pontificians, Transubstantiators by *Hoc* an indefinite inseparable something. For *Hoc* points out something certain and present. Or, something particular or individual of a more

* Answering to the English *this*, in the masculine and neuter genders.

general substance, which may produce the same with what is predicated, or be substituted for the same, as Scotus speaks, so that the things which are signified by the subject and the attribute, may not differ from one another, except by the various reason (ratione) of conceiving, so that the sense is, This that is contained under the appearances of the bread and wine is my body and blood. For so the enunciation would be identical with the subject itself (re ipsa) and an overthrowing of the sign. Or, even that which the bread and wine were before. For the words having at length been uttered, the bread and wine are made and so are the body and blood of the Lord—according to the prevailing sentiment of Pontificians. Nor finally, are the appearances or accidents of bread and wine, the color, the smell, the taste, the figure, to be understood, for that is in very deed to take away the verity of signs and substitute what are phantastical and delusory—denying that the substance remains, and having them dangling in the air.

Nor with Consubstantiatists or Impanatists (to which sentiment very many Scholastics incline, such as Scotus and Aliaco, &c., being about to embrace it, had not the authority of the Lateran Synod, held in the year 1215, restrained them; whence also Luther borrowed it) by *hoc* shall be signified, in, with, or under this, or *hic*, that is, the bread and body, the wine and the blood: since bread is not suitable for taking up into it the body, nor can the body go under it, each being compact and unlike, and the wine is not something under which another liquid can lie concealed, each one occupying its own limit and mingling with itself. Further, because the comprehension of the thing under another, is not here borne in mind, but its signification and exhibition, that is, not where, or under what, is the body and blood of the Lord, which is to make a predicate out of the subject, but what is that bread and wine.

The attribute is the body and blood of Christ, that is, his flesh and gore, which are dead, as in John 6. The Syrian every where renders it PAGRA, that is, cadaver, a

dead body. And here indeed, it is said, of the Testament or covenant. A testament being put for a covenant according to the interpretation of the Seventy, as the compound word *διαθήκη*, is used for, to covenant (Luke 22: 29, 30), although here a testamental covenant is understood—to each of which death takes place for the confirmation of each—there, of the victim, (whence it is said to strike a covenant)—here of the Testator, to which the apostle alludes. (Heb. 9: 16.) And it is said, *of the new*, the old being put in opposition to it: that of the new consisting in the reconciliation of an offended God and of miserable men and the saving promise through the proper blood of Christ set forth, not another blood, as was that of the Old Testament. Therefore, the blood of the New Testament is that by which it was agreed to and ratified. Or it is said, *the New Testament in the blood of Christ*, as Luke and Paul have it, by the same, that is, by the customary mode of speaking among the Hebrews, in which the particle *in* notes the instrument and mode, that is to say, as having been established by blood: and these are promiscuously used by the evangelists, because blood and the New Testament are most intimately conjoined.

Moreover, this is added to the blood rather than to the body, by way of efficiency (for it is not said the body of the New Testament, or the New Testament in the body), not that each does not concur with regard to the reason of the New Testament. For a covenant was also ratified by the immolation of the body, but because the extreme passion, death, of Christ, is the more evident in the shedding of his blood. And truly allusion was made to the words of Moses, (Ex. 24) repeated by Paul (Heb. 9: 20). *Behold the blood of the covenant which God hath enjoined unto you.*

An *exegetis*, or *explication*, is added to each attribute; concerning the body indeed, *which is given for you*, that is delivered up as (John 6: 51) (the present being used for the paulopost future, for the purpose of indicating the time as at hand, as also the certainty of the affair and of faith, by the usual kind of speaking, John 10: 17. Luke 22: 22),—

that is to say, unto death, and as Paul, is *broken*, metaphorically, that is, will be affixed, immolated, slain, by a separation of the soul from the body: in which there is an allusion to the breaking of bread. But concerning the blood, *which is shed for you*, by the same enallage of tense—that is to say, on the cross, not in the cup, although the words of Luke, if you look at the construction, refer to the cup, but if you consider the very thing, they refer to the blood, so that it is a manifest solecism, which Hebraism is not unusual in Scripture (as Luke 5: 10, &c.); and that too, *for you and many*, that is to say, for those who were about to believe in future, for without shedding of blood there is no remission (Heb. 9: 22). And, for like reason, that assertion is also to be transferred from this member to the other.

Therefore, truly, *the natural body* which reclined at the table with the disciples, about to be seized, crucified, delivered up to death, and the blood which was then in the veins and after a little time to be shed, is, each, understood. Not, therefore, a body, metaphorical, incircumscribed, phantastic, spiritual, invisible, impalpable, illocal, yea, as consubstantialists wish, ubiquitous and impanated, and as transubstantiators would maintain, transubstantiated out of bread—that is a body not a body.

But although in sacred Scripture, body and blood, (blood being taken for the life which is in the blood, Gen. 9: 4), are sometimes taken for the whole man, (Heb. 2: 14), yea, synecdochically for the incarnate Son of God, or for the person of the Son of God, (John 6: 53,) (by which will be signified that whole Christ sets forth his whole self to us and that our whole selves have communion with him), nevertheless, this is not the only nor the proper end of his manner of speaking. Verily then the body and blood, as parts of a whole, are considered conjunctly and not disjunctively, as is done in this place.

Therefore, *Christ* here is considered not simply and absolutely as *man*, also he is to be considered as God-man, but under a certain acceptation and condition, that is to say, as a man in a low estate and indeed in an extreme stage of lowness, that is as crucified and dead; but not as alive

and glorious, that is, obnoxious to no afflictions and mundane affections and death, any more, and so not to be called down from above to these beggarly elements of the world. (Rom. 10: 6.)

That, moreover, is verified by these evident reasons: 1. Because the species—the bread, and that not moistened by dipping, but dry, and the wine—naturally separated—are taken by Christ from their position and use—to designate the separation of his body and blood: 2. Because that both the body and blood thus separated are set forth, which in a living and glorious state are united: 3. Because it is said of the body itself, *which is given and broken for you*, as also of the blood, *which is shed*, so that the bloodless body is indicated, and the blood without the veins—which are called by the Latins flesh and gore: 4. Because it is called the *blood of the Testament or covenant*, or the Testament or covenant or blood, inasmuch as it is confirmed by the shedding of blood and by death: 5. Because it is considered as a sacrifice, which relates to the killing in sacrifice and death of a living creature: 6. Because flesh and blood are here afforded for a complete feast, consisting in spiritual eating and drinking. For it is said of the bread, which he called his body, *Eat*, and, of the wine, which he called his blood, *Drink*. But truly no one eats a perfect or living animal, but that which is dead, nor does any one drink blood that is in the veins, but at least that which has been shed. And, finally, because Christ orders it to be done to his *remembrance*, which the apostle interprets of his death, (1 Cor. 11: 26). The death, he says, of the Lord ye will show till he comes.

Wherefore Pontificians, and others, over and above, and contrary to the mind of Christ, here consider Christ promiscuously, humble as well as glorious; inasmuch as it is not suitable to the glorious state to bring Christ back again to earth and the beggarly elements of the world. Moreover by their own act they contradict themselves, since they impress upon their wafers or hosts, an image of Christ crucified.

Thus, in fine, *Christ himself*, and indeed humble, and

dead, is understood, that together with himself *the merits of his death*, his benefits and gifts, virtue, efficacy, that is to say, remission of sins, righteousness and eternal life, may be comprehended. (John 6: 51, 52, 53, 54.) Whence it is subjoined, *which is given and broken and shed for the remission of sins*, and thus, (Matth. 26: 29. Luke 22: 29, 30.) For these three things must be inseparably conjoined, Christ—his death and promised benefits—and their efficacy. Whence they do not deliver the truth with sufficient fullness who interpret by the body and blood, the merit and efficacy only.

The *copula* or link by which the predicate is connected with the subject, is the substantive verb *εστι*, *is*. The Hebrews, since they are destitute of a present participle in the *HAIJA*, which is to them in the place of the present verb, except that they sometimes use *IESCH*, have that understood, or they use pronouns in its place, and for the third person, *HU*, *ipse*—that is to say, this itself my body, which is equivalent to *is*. Luke also, in the other clause concerning the cup, omits the same word, which also prevails among the Latins when a demonstrative word is placed first. But Paul has it in full. And since its use is to conjoin the subject with the predicate in a proposition, as well as to shew after what manner they are mutually affected, it is in this manner, and not tropically, to be understood. But it by the present tense indicates what the *subject matter* (*res*) is, and its present existence, not what it may be made, not any action or undergoing (*passionem*) of the subject matter: which is indicated by, let it be made, or be it, and it was made (Matth. 4: 8. John 2: 9); so that it is, *the bread is, that is, truly exists* my body, &c.

Wherefore truly, Pontificians act irrationally who attribute to the word *is* a practical or energetical, that is, operative efficacy: and, in very fact, they interpret *is*, *is* transubstantiated: and others, *is* consubstantiated, or conjoined or sacramentally united, which they will have it to be, not only really, but also substantially: inasmuch as the language is about that which is—not about that which is made (*de esse non de fieri*).

So much about the several words out of which *these propositions* rise: these are moreover those, as far as the external discourse is considered, which are *figurative* or *tropical*, as appears from the connexion of the predicate with the subject. Not that the trope is in the whole sentence (for the trope pertains to a word) but that it relates to the whole sentence. For words, of themselves, are not tropical, but conjoined into a sentence, where results the trope. For the cause of a trope is one thing—its seat another. These three things are to be considered: First, whether there is a trope in those words of the Lord: Next, where it is, or what is the seat of the trope: and finally, what it is and of what sort.

That there is indeed a *trope*, is confirmed from the cause of a trope, and First, from the reason (*ratione*) of the subject. For bread and wine are the subject, not the body or blood of the Lord under those species, as Papists claim, or under, with, in, bread and wine, as Luther (*ex Cameracensi*); as was before proved, of which it cannot properly be said, that they are the body and blood of Christ, since a contradiction would be involved. For they are different; of which the one cannot be the other, no, not indeed by the omnipotence of God, as Scotus says, and of which it may be affirmed that they cannot properly be mutually predicated of each other.

In the next place, from that which has been predicated, for the body and blood here are the broken body and shed blood, that is Christ humble and dead, and indeed in a state such as was not yet, and now is no more, nor can be. But truly nothing can be changed into that, or substantially conjoined with that, and for that cause be properly called, what in very fact it was not yet, nor any more is, nor can be. Otherwise a contradiction would be involved. For his same self would be such like, and not such like, that is to say, humble and glorious, dead and alive. Wherefore the mode of speaking is improper, and true, to them, a view of the subject-matter as about to be, to us, by a remembrance of it as past.

Moreover, that there is a trope is confirmed, because the cup, that is, that which is in the cup, is called Testament or covenant, or Testamental covenant in blood, which cannot be said of the chalice or wine, moreover of the blood indeed, inasmuch as that it is properly a testament or covenant: for they belong to different categories. In like manner by a similar reason (*ratione*) of speaking the apostle (1 Cor. 10) calls the bread and wine the communion of the body and blood of Christ, and, For we being many are one bread and one body. Therefore there is a manifest Trope.

It answers to a trope, because Christ orders that to be done to his remembrance and memory, and the apostle, ye do show forth the death of the Lord till he comes, which could not be truly said, if the bread and wine were properly and substantially, or under their species, the body and blood of the Lord; since it is not the memory of a subject-matter present—nor could he be said to be about to come, who is substantially present.

Finally, this tropical phraseology is very common in Sacraments. So it is said, Circumcision is a covenant of God, which presently is a token of the covenant, (Gen. 17) and by Paul it is called a seal of the righteousness of faith, (Rom 4). The lamb killed is the passover, (Ex. 12). The rock of which the Israelites drank was Christ, (1 Cor. 10), where a comparison is instituted with the Lord's Supper, &c.

We here have the Fathers agreeing with us, who say, that the bread and wine,—*suo more*, in a manner peculiar to itself, Prosp. in Sentent. quodammodo, Augustin in Psal. 83 juxta quendam modum, after a certain manner, Idem epist. 83, ad Bonif. quasi and tanquam, as if, as it were, —are the body and blood, Chrysost. de Eucharistia in Encaen, and Homil. 84 in Johan. and mystery or sacrament, Chrysost., in an unfinished work, Homil. II., not the true body, but the mystery of the body, he says, August. ad Bonif. 23, Epist. the type or figure, Tertull. against Marc., book 4, August. ad Psal. 3, Ambros. de Sacram. lib. 4, cap. 5,

antitype or pattern, Nazianz. in Apolog. Basil in Anaphore Syra. Maca. Hom. 27, Symbol. Dionysius, Clemens Alexand. Origen. Theod. Dial. 1., sign. August. cont. Adl. mant. c. 12, image and likeness, Gelas cont. Eutyech, pledge, Hier. in ad, 1 Cor. 11, of the body and blood of the Lord. Moreover, that it is the body and blood in a mystery, Prosp. in Sentet., not, he says, in the verity of the subject-matter, but in a mystery signifying it, in a sign, or through a sign, August. contra. Adim. c. 12, in signification or by signification, August. in Levitic. 9 : 57, by similitude, Ambros. de Sacram. lib. 4, c. 5, by appellation, Chrysost. ad Caesar. Morach. Besides, that they sign or signify Ambros. ad 1 Cor. 11, that they represent, Tertull. con. Marc. lib. 4. The body and blood, &c. and Augustinus elegantly l. 3. c. 16, de Doctr. Christ., and other Fathers, as Clemens Alexand. August. de Doctr. Christ., say that it is a Figurative and allegoric mode of speaking.

Concerning the seat of the trope, there is a variety of sentiments among the Orthodox, although they generally accord in the principal point of the subject-matter. Some will have it that there is a trope in no part, neither in the subject, nor in the predicate, nor in the copula. For these severally are to be properly understood. But, that the predication is Figurative. So Beza after Zanchius. Crelilius opposes a Logical figurative proposition to that which is Rhetorical and places that in the whole enunciation, this in the word. But since the Logical belongs to the mind and internal reason, not to the language, there is no figurative predication of it, but only the figure of a Rhetorical mode of speaking, And although its cause is from the attribution, its seat, nevertheless, is in some or other and certain part.

Others, therefore, place the trope in the subject, or in the demonstrative word *Hoc this*, as Bucer, so that by this is signified the bread with the body, and the wine with the blood, on account of a sacramental union, by which means, however, it is not necessary that both the one and the other should be constituted substantially present, but only

really, so that the bread and the wine may be demonstrated to the sense, the body and blood of the Lord to the mind. And they say that it is so done in all modes of speaking by which imperceptible and absent things are promised and set forth by signs—therefore the sense may have been ; *Hoc, this*, which I give you by this sign, is my body, &c. But there is no mention of the body before made, as is shown by *Hoc, this*, and the declaration of that union is first made by these words.

Others put the trope in the word *is*, taken for signifies—doing so after the Batavian Honius, whom Zuinglius preceded as to this sentiment. And truly *is*, among other significations, is not seldom understood for signifies, as when interpreting words from one tongue into another we say, *that is*, what avails the same, signifies. (Matth 1: 23.) And it is understood of things, the seven ears and the seven kine are seven years, (Gen. 40: 13, 19, and 41: 26), the seed is the word of God, the field is the world, (Matth. 13: 37, 38), the seven stars are the seven angels, &c., the many waters are many people, (Rev. 1: 20, and 17: 15.) Also, it is taken for to be like, as I am that bread, the true vine, the door. John is Elias, Herod is a Fox. In these places a metaphor is in the predicate. Under this head also they refer those sacramental modes of speaking, Circumcision is the Covenant, the Lamb is the Passover, the Rock was Christ, the Cup is the New Testament. Nevertheless these convey not only signification and similitude, but obsignation and exhibition. But *is*, has in part the rationem (reason) of the predicate, in part that of the copula, when such is the case, as is evident from a resolution of the word.

Others, finally, place the trope with Oecolampadius, in the word of body and blood, and then *is*, will only be a vinculum, and the sense will be, bread and wine is the symbol, the seal, the obsignation, pledge, earnest, representation, of the body and blood. This sentiment is corroborated by this very firm argument: Into whatever part

the analysis or resolution of the tropical mode of speaking falls into that which is proper, in that is the trope: But that truly falls into the words of body and blood, the nominative case being changed, not the oblique. For as Circumcision is the covenant, is resolved into that it is the sign of the covenant, so bread and wine is the body and blood, is resolved into that proper part, it is the communion of the body and blood of the Lord, not whereby bread has, but whereby the faithful have communion with the body of Christ. Therefore the trope is rightly placed in the predicate.

It does not, however, thence follow, that the verity of the body and blood of Christ is taken away from the Supper—and that a tropical and symbolical body and blood are introduced, contrary to that, This is my body which is broken for you, this is my blood which is shed for you, which argument indeed, after Scotus, Pontificians, and they who follow Luther, urge as deserving to bear the palm. But it is one thing, that there is a trope in the word of body, and another that the body is tropical; the symbol of a body is one thing—and a symbolical body is another thing. That leaves the verity of the body—this takes it away. And truly by a trope of this kind is not denied what is, but another thing besides is added to it, as signifying, and each is included. Whence Cajatanus against Thomas rightly answers to an argument of Scotus: But the true body is not taken away although a trope is accounted to have its place, as when it is said, the Rock was Christ, that is, a symbol of the true Christ, about to be born in future of the Virgin Mary, to be crucified, to be slain, &c. So also here, for it is one thing to inquire what the predicate is, and another, after what manner that is in the subject.

But it is hence also clear that the *kind of trope* is, so to speak, a metonymy, which also Augustin acknowledges, the thing signified being moreover put for the sign, and indeed being analogical, that is, sustaining a proportionated likeness to the thing signified. For, as Augustin says,

unless sacraments should have a likeness of those things of which they are sacraments, they would not truly be sacraments. Nor that alone, but they are signs of this sort with which the body and blood of the Lord, the things signified are present, conjoined and united after a manner that is peculiar (*suo modo*) (sacramentally it is granted, that is, really indeed, to wit, *χαρακ*, respectively, agreeably to a peculiar constitution, but not substantially); yea are changed, as the Fathers speak, not in their very substance and nature, but in their condition, use and function. Moreover, they are, as it were, vehicles, instruments, through which is exhibited or offered to all, but is conveyed to the believing, is given and by the faithful is taken the very body and blood of Christ; which is proper and natural to a sacrament. In a phrase of the same kind the apostle says, the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one who believeth, and the bread which we break, that is the breaking and eating of the bread, is the communion of the body of Christ.

Whence Christ, instead of being disposed to use the proper kind of speaking, preferred to say, This is my body, and this is my blood, improperly attributing to the bread and wine the name of body and blood, and of the latter *in* it which is something, as if the enunciation was essential, to wit, for clear signification, on account of the great likeness and analogy of these signs to the thing signified, for the sake of the sealing, confirmation, certainty, greater certainty, setting forth and giving of the thing signified by these signs (for these words have the included promise of the thing made by God added to the external signs, which from God's part is offered to all, on our part is received by faith) which emphasis and energy of sentence no proper enunciation whatever distantly approaches. And in this sacramental *ομοιωσις* and habitude, the essential form of the dominical supper consists.

On which account, Pontifical transubstantiators and others, who are consubstantialists, asserting these things to have been properly enunciated, are grievously deceived.

Nor do they themselves truly say that which Scripture says, as their interpretation shows. For it is not inquired what is made out of the bread, or where the body is or hides and where the blood of Christ, whether under the naked appearances, whether under the bread and wine, which in very deed is to make subjects out of predicates. And then since by *this* they understand either the external appearances of bread and wine, as the former or the latter, bread and wine, and comprehend the body and blood of the Lord as contained under them—necessarily they both introduce into the subject the trope of synecdoche. And finally since to these very things they besides attribute the reason of the signs, without which nothing is a sacrament, which cannot be done without certain words of the institution (for the signs are from what is instituted) which words declare the act of him who signifies, which are not other even out of their own mind than, This is my body, this is my blood, that the reason of the predicate may be suitable to the subject, willing or unwilling, they have necessarily to acknowledge a metonymy in the predicate, unless they overturn the whole manner of a sacrament and sign.

Finally in these words of Christ is *αιτιολογια*, a connexion of these enunciations with the preceding command, which is explained by the ratiocinative particle *for* : which indeed is omitted in what is previously enunciated of the bread, but is expressed in the other concerning the cup, whence also there it is to be supplied, as the translator has done. Christ had said, eat this bread and drink this wine, or *this*, in the accusative case, because *this* in the nominative case, is my body and blood, where *this*, in both places notes the same thing, that it may be the connexion of the terms in the syllogism : and for that cause, eat and drink this, because to eat and drink this, is to eat and drink my body. And thus the sublimity of this mystery is declared and its necessity.

What however they thence infer—therefore the body of the Lord is eaten with the mouth and his blood drunk (because an oral eating and drinking of that is commanded, which is the body and blood of the Lord, which is the chief

argument for oral eating and drinking—by no means follows, but this only—that the bread is eaten and the wine drunk (as syntax demands that ; for there is no other accusative case with which, eat ye, can be construed) which are after a manner peculiar to themselves (*suo modo*) the Lord's body and blood. Moreover as to all those acts of Christ and such as have been prescribed by the disciples, one thing is metaphorically and synedochically intended and ordered for the sense, another for the mind. For as bread is called the body and wine the blood of Christ, so to take, to eat this bread and to drink this wine, they are so to be corporally received, that they also may be spiritually understood.

What remains is *Νομοθεσία*, the legislation, made for the Universal Church to the end of time, and ratified into a perpetual law, in these words: This do in remembrance of me, which Luke has as to the former enunciation, and Paul as to both—adding besides to the latter, as oft as ye drink ; whence as to the former it should likewise be supplied, as oft as ye eat.

Christ, moreover, in that sacred action, addresses the apostles as pastors and dispensers of his mysteries, and representing his person, as well as representing the whole assembly of the faithful, because he commands, This do, where This is not referred to the body and blood, and to that which he had said he would suffer ; but to all that which the Lord had done about the bread and cup ; to the whole, I say, that preceded, to wit, what you have here seen me, the founder of the feast do, that also I command to be done by you, the guests.

Therefore, as my ministers, do ye this, that is, by a perpetual rite, take the bread, bless the bread, or invoke a blessing upon it, and break it, give and say in my name, This is my body, or Christ's ; also the cup, &c. In like manner, ye that commune, do ye this, that is, take, eat, drink, which is manifest from this that Paul accommodates these things not to pastors alone, but chiefly to the whole Church of the Corinthians, so that to do is interpreted, eat,

and drink, whilst he thus relates the words of Christ, This also as oft as ye drink, &c., and *avaloyas*, as oft as ye eat. The same is the more evident from the added aetiology, For as often as ye eat and drink, &c. And it is clear from the conclusion, Therefore whosoever shall eat and drink, &c., where the necessity of obedience is made imperative upon all the faithful, and the liberty of the Church is shown in the frequentation of the Dominical Supper.

Whence it is truly apparent how foolishly Papalists talk, who place in these words the foundation of the Missatic sacrifice, taking to do for the sacrifice, because it is so taken both by the Greeks (*ποιων θυσιας*) and by the Latins (*facere seu operari*) as, Cum faciam vitulâ, &c. Virg. But then it is joined with the ablative of the thing: whereas, by the Hebrews, it is connected with the accusative case of the thing which is offered for a sacrifice (Num. 28 : 6), and that too with the design annexed—for a sacrifice. But this phraseology, This do, is never taken in that sense, but always demonstrates the action going before, to wit, what ye see me do. And truly Christ did not then offer himself under the appearances of bread and wine, but said that he must be offered up. Otherwise he had twice offered himself, once in the bread and wine, and again on the altar of the cross: which is absurd.

To this command, furthermore, is added the universal end of the Dominical Supper, as it must be administered and used, in commemoration or remembrance of me, which Paul interprets, in memory of my death, For, he says, as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye will show forth the Lord's death, that is, ye will celebrate with the profession of faith and the giving of thanks, till he come, that is, again appear to judge the quick and dead. By this last advent he limits the duration of the age, and declares that the use of the Dominical Supper will be perpetual. With this end also, another very illustrious one is to be conjoined, namely, union and communion with Christ, and the participation of all his benefits, which Paul opens (1 Cor. 10 : 16, 17), for, he says, we being many are

one bread, one body ; (12: 18) And have all been made to drink into one spirit.

But as this remembrance and showing forth of Christ's death is its end, so by the apostle Paul, its worthy use is limited by a preceding probation of each one for himself, that is to say, whether he is in the faith (2 Cor. 13: 5) and is affected with a serious repentance, according to that of Paul, But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup. By this private exploration of himself—his public one is not taken away from others, but is established. On the contrary, abuse exists, and he eats and drinks unworthily, who discerns not the body (and therefore also the blood) of the Lord (29), that is, does not distinguish both symbols, this bread and this cup, which are, by sacramental *symploze*, (habitude), the body of the Lord and his blood, from common bread and wine, does not distinguish the taking of them, between the one and the other, that is to say, the sacred from the profane, according to that verse (34), And if any man hunger let him eat at home, that ye come not together unto condemnation : and on that account despises and affects with ignominy the body itself which is truly offered ; and accordingly on account of the atrocious injury thus brought upon Christ, becomes guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, (27) and eats and drinks judgment to himself, that is, procures for himself the penalty of judgment in the scourges of God and in death itself, (29, 30.)

Thence from Matthew and Mark is added the notice of Christ about his departure and the new celestial life in which he was about to have them as partakers, whilst he says, But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom. These words in Luke are referred to the Paschal feast. Whether they are recited in their order and place by them, or twice repeated by Christ, is uncertain. At least they must be referred in common and analogically to each, both the Paschal and Sacramental feast.

What here in Matthew and Mark is *but*, in Luke is *for*, as a reason is given why he represents that cup as abolished (*απολυτατον*). By *fruit of the vine* wine is paraphrastically understood, after which manner it is here called even after consecration and reception. And more than that, the same is also analogically understood of the bread, as is evident from Luke. Besides he says that he will no more eat and drink of this (specifically) in common from the subsequent word, *with you*, repeated. Therefore himself had drunk with them and previously tasted before that he offered them to his own. For himself so willed to initiate and consecrate in himself this sacrament, as before in the instance of Baptism. And this also had a peculiar signification in it, to wit, that of death. (Matth. 20 : 22, and 26 : 39.) He next places a limit of that abstinence, whilst he says, *from this time or any more*. He indeed drank, after the resurrection, with the apostles, (Acts 1 : 4, and 10 : 41), but economically, not after the customary manner of the present life, but for the purpose of producing faith in the resurrection. The repetition he truly indicates whilst he says, until I shall drink that new—that is, another. So new tongues. (Mark 16 : 17.) Luke calls other or different from the customary. But it is understood like to that, and passes over from the proper to the metaphorical, so that it is the same and not the same, as Christ often does. (John 8 : 13, and 6 : 27, 32, &c.) It is added *with you*—they having been taken into the same condition and fruition of blessedness signified by drinking ; and that too, *in the kingdom of my Father*, withdrawing them from the kingdom of grace to the kingdom of glory, and declaring *the ultimate end* of this Sacrament. (Luke 22 : 29, 30.)

Finally, giving of thanks is subjoined, and when he had sung a hymn, they went out unto the Mount of Olives. Understand, Christ leading and the apostles uniting in the song. What that hymn may have been is not related. Burgensis notes it to have been the 118th Psalm, with the five following, which are called by the Hebrews, even at the present day, the great Halleluja, that is, great hymn,

which, in their yearly festivals, especially those of the pass-over, they were wont to chant. What if we may refer to that illustrious supplication (John 17)? Truly Christ, both beginning and ending this sacred performance, by the giving of thanks, has left an example to the Church in the action or use of this Sacrament.

And this is our plain and full sentiment about the Lord's Supper out of the word of God, in which we have unfolded and asserted the integrity and verity of the signs and the thing signified, their characteristic (*σχετικὸν*) association (conjunctionem) and union, also their use and efficacy. These things can suffice modest capacities, serve for the consolation of the faithful, and put bounds to controversy among brethren; if prejudice is absent and the desire of contending—which evils, the Church of God has not (1 Cor. 11; 16) and become not the pious, (Philip. 2: 3).

Clemens Alexand. in Paedag. lib. 2 c. 2. Himself also used wine, for himself also was man; and he blessed the wine, when he said, Take, drink, this is my blood. The Word, the blood of the vine, which is shed for many for the remission of sins, allegorically signifies a holy flowing of joy. And presently: But what the wine was, which was blessed, he again showed, saying to the disciples, I will not drink of the fruit of this vine, until I shall have drunk it with you in the kingdom of my Father.

Cyprianus in Sermone de Unct. Christi. The Lord gave on the table on which he participated of the last feast with the apostles, with his own hands the bread and wine, but the body he delivered to the hands of the soldiers to be wounded on the cross, that the sincere verity having been impressed upon the apostles and the true sincerity might each be shown to the nations, how wine and bread might be flesh and blood, and for what reasons the causes might answer to the effects and different names or appearances (species) be limited to one essence, and the signifying and the signified things be expressed by words of the same sort.

Chrysost. ad Caeser. Monach. Before the bread is sanctified, we call it bread, but divine grace sanctifying it, the priest consecrating, it has indeed been freed from the appellation of bread and has become accounted worthy of the appellation of the Lord's body, although the nature of bread has continued in itself.

Balanus Manus de Institut. Cleric. lib. 1, cap. 31.

The Lord preferred the sacraments of his body and blood to be perceived by the mouth of the faithful and conducive to their food, that by the visible performance the invisible effect might be shown. For as outward, material food nourishes the body and makes it grow, so also the word of the Lord within nourishes and strengthens the soul. And presently, the Sacrament is perceived by the mouth, by virtue of the sacrament the inner man is sated, the Sacrament is turned into the aliment of the body, but by the virtue of the Sacrament the dignity of eternal life is obtained, &c. As, therefore, that is converted into us when we eat and drink it, so we also are converted into the body of Christ whilst we live obediently and piously, &c. Therefore, because bread strengthens the heart of the body, so that is called the body of Christ: but because wine operates on the blood in the flesh, so it is referred to the blood of Christ.

Christianus Danthmarus in Matth.

The Lord gave to his disciples the Sacrament of his body for the remission of sins and for the preservation of charity, that mindful always of that which had been done, they should do this after a figure, which was about to be given for them, and not be forgetful of this charity. This is my body, that is, in the Sacrament, &c.

ART. VI.—SCIENCE FOR DOMESTIC PURPOSES.

THE CHEMISTRY OF COMMON LIFE, by James F. W. Johnston, M. A., F. R. SS. L. & E., &c. Author of Lectures on Agricultural Chemistry and Geology, &c. William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London, 1854. 2 Vols.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF COMMON LIFE; or the Science of Health, by John Scoffern, M. B., London, Late Prof. of Chemistry and Medical Jurisprudence at the Aldersgate School of Medicine. London: Ward & Lock, 158, Fleet Street. 1857.

THE HAND-BOOK OF HOUSEHOLD SCIENCE. A popular account of Heat, Light, Air, Aliment, and Cleansing, in their scientific principles and domestic applications. With illustrative diagrams. By Edward L. Youmans, Author of "The Class-Book of Chemistry," &c., &c. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1857.

Who has not been interested, as well as amused, by Schiller's poem, Pegasus in Harness? The fruitless efforts, made to degrade the steed that, Mythology teaches us, had been tamed alone by Minerva's hand and donated by her for the uses of the Goddesses of the Fine Arts—the Muses, show us that the superior can never be *degraded* to an inferior position without losing every thing implied in the idea of degradation. We are not to conclude, that the benefits of Poetry and Aesthetic culture are intended to be confined to a small and select class of human beings, but that they are world-wide in their applications, requiring, however, an elevation of the human mind to appreciate them, which elevation, indeed, their very presence tends to accomplish, and that they must not be levelled *down* to the condition of the prosaic and vulgar. All efforts to put Pegasus in the harness, so that he shall drag the plough or draw the cart will be ineffective, but let him be mounted by the aspiring son of earth and the winged steed will bear his burden aloft through regions of beauty and grandeur. He is to be employed *in* his proper sphere, and not compelled to work *out* of it.

The same idea may be applied with considerable truth in looking at the proper mode of studying, or rather of using, the discoveries of Physical or Natural Science. These are truths, the results of immutable laws framed by unerring Wisdom. They are necessarily of a character to command the respect and the admiration of man. But they must not be solely considered in an utilitarian point of view, lest we lose the ability of commanding them in their loftiest flights, and find, although we have gained a second rate plough-horse, we have lost a steed of truest mettle. The course of wisdom obviously is to employ Science in *its* proper sphere, when we shall see that while it unfolds more and more of the true secrets of nature—affording us means to apply all these to our daily wants—it, at the same time, enlarges our mental vision and teaches us to appreciate the grandeur of God's creation. Thus we shall get more practical benefit from Science than if we had cramped it in our workshops, enslaved it in our kitchens or enshackled it in our sewers.

Men are always apt to be extremists,—some absolutely theoretical abjure all applications of their theories, and others purely practical, as they improperly style themselves, exhibit absolute contempt for all theory. Schiller has accurately defined the different extremes in his distich on Wissenschaft,

Einem ist sie die hohe, die himmlische Göttin, dem Andern
Eine tüchtige Kuh, die ihn mit Butter versorgt.

Now we hold that both are wrong and both are right,—the error on either side consisting in not recognizing the other. Science is eminently practical, but she is also far above mere questions of dollars and cents. The practical benefits are showered on all sides upon his head who reads her laws aright and respects her Mission. She works for his good without being put in harness, and does nothing for him when degraded to such a position. It is interesting to glance at the lights she brings to the illumination of daily problems in domestic life,—to see how she can clear up difficulties and aid in their being surmounted as well in

the kitchen as in the workshop,—as well in the routine of daily home life as abroad amid the puffing of steam and the clicking of telegraphic instruments.

We propose to occupy a few of our pages with some general considerations on the employment of Natural Science for Domestic Purposes, looking at the subject as the result of discoveries which are by no means confined to such applications, but are embodiments of grand and expressive truths, and basing our considerations upon the three treatises, whose titles constitute the rubric of this article. We trust that our article may not be considered out of place amid the theological and philosophical discussions with which the Review is mostly occupied, as we seek "as far as possible to adapt the latter, in style and in the variety of its contents, to the wants and tastes of different classes of readers."

It is noteworthy, how few of the rising generation seem to have profited by the scientific instruction which has been furnished them in the academic curriculum. The theoretical course has been adopted to so great an extent that they have forgotten, if they ever knew, that the laws of science are demonstrating their truth on all sides around them. Hence when an every-day fact is pointed out as illustrative of a scientific law they are in the predicament of Molière's Mons. Jourdain, whose astonishment was very great when he found *il y a plus de quarante ans que je dis de la prose, sans que j'en susse rien*. Now, however, the time has come when every one can master the philosophy of common life with ease, because it has been reduced to a system, and his ignorance becomes, with each day, less and less excusable. The three authors, Johnston, Scoffern and Youmans, have, with great zeal and commendable carefulness, endeavored to present the applications of Science to the uses and things of common life, so as to be grasped by the comprehension of every one, although they have brought the most abstruse laws at times into requisition for the illustration of some point. Their books show an immense advance over the loose and unscientific statements which filled the pages of

school books, as late as twenty-five years ago, when children were taught that there were but *four* elements, and when Sandford and Morton constituted quite a Repository of Science for the young. Of the three, Johnston has been called to another world when he was acquiring a high position in this world's esteem for his scientific attainments; Scoffern has used his pen largely for the popularization of scientific facts, and Youmans is known to his countrymen as an excellent, enthusiastic lecturer and good teacher of his favorite specialité—Chemistry. The first has written with great zeal, about "the air we breathe and the water we drink," the cultivation of the soil with the nature of the vegetables it may produce for aliment, the liquors, narcotics and sweets which we from time to time employ, the nature and needs of digestion, as well as the chemical functions of the body. He has freely laid Natural History under heavy contributions to furnish him information, which, with a wonderfully interesting style, he has invested with all the charms of romance and furnished a book—the first of its kind. Scoffern has rather labored, with the view of exhibiting the relations of external things to the life and health of the human being, showing how "violations to the immutable laws of public health, may be reduced to the three sources of—ignorance, accident, and crime." The two first mentioned, are treated of at some length, avoiding all considerations connected with the last source as more peculiarly connected with a treatise on legal Hygiene. He has not brought the amount of genius, the extent of knowledge, and the charm of style to the production of his book, of which traces are to be seen all through Johnston. Youmans has confined himself within narrower limits than either of his co-laborers, only attempting to show in a popular way, what is the science of Heat, Light, Air, Food and Cleansing, and how all this science is really beneficial for Domestic purposes. The attempt has been very successful, resulting in a book which should find a place wherever a thinking man wishes to know the nature of the physical conditions that are essential to his

life. But does this kind of knowledge lead to materialistic views? Are we, as some think, prone to lose sight of the grand primal cause while we become cognizant of the secondary causes which He has established in connection with natural phenomena? We believe such views are *not* the inevitable result of this kind of study. Such a result will follow the study of any department of human knowledge, if the mind is allowed to wander off from thoughts connected with its duty to the Creator and His Laws. It is a fallacious argument to claim, because one has become an infidel during his study of any subject, that hence the subject itself leads to infidelity or materialism from its very nature. True logic would require us to show that such is the inevitable consequence—the tendency given the mind by the subject, and that no other tendency could possibly be preserved by any mind devoted to its examination. Admit the force of the common argument, that every thing must be materialistic which numbers materialists among its cultivators, and some of the most interesting and important branches of human knowledge would be entitled to the contempt of the good and the wise. Be a man, in his inmost soul, a scoffer at religion, and all the knowledge in the world will not make him devout. Give him an open ear to the truths of the former and the facts of the latter, opening up so much that exhibits marks of design and wisdom, will make him all the more devout and reverential for the knowledge he has thus acquired.

There can be no doubt as to the enlarged views which man acquires from the teachings of Science, learning through the labors of a Galileo “a plan of the heavens so appalling in amplitude that imagination itself falters in the survey;” through the zeal and eloquence of Miller how to read “the handwriting of God upon the rocks, revealing the history of our planet and its inhabitants through durations of which the mind had never before even presumed to dream;” and gaining by the labors of Ehrenberg and others, a sight of “a new world of order and beauty in all the commonest and vulgarest forms of matter, below the

former reach of eye or thought." But when we glance at the subjects which elucidate Domestic Science, we shall find that the same effects are produced on the mind by the most *intimate* relation we establish with its separate truths, as we feel when viewing them from a distant stand-point as a whole.

The light which comes streaming down to us from the sun at a velocity of one hundred and ninety-two thousand miles per second, when analyzed by the physicist, is not only so much the better understood for this analysis, so that the laws of vision become clearer to man's comprehension and he is enabled to apply compensating measures for defective sight, but a world of greater wonders is opened up for his admiration than ever poet dreamed of. He has not only learned that this light may be decomposed into seven primary colors, and these again resolved into three out of which all possible shades may be formed. He has not only learned how to combine colors so as to produce the most beautiful effects, to furnish beauty with adornments which will show the exquisite taste of woman, to minister to the extortionate demands of fashion, and to prevent monstrous combinations that would shock the eye attuned to harmonious combinations. He has not only learned why it is that certain colors are complementary of others, or, when combined with them, will produce the most pleasing effects, as when orange is contrasted with blue, violet with yellow, or red with green, because such combinations really are required to produce white. He has not only acquired the knowledge that would suggest to the brunette, that with yellow colors her complexion will become brighter and fresher, and to the blonde, that with blue, her white complexion and light flesh tints will be improved. If this were all, the results would indeed be merely *material* benefits. But the grandeur of his study becomes a real ministering agent to his reverence for the great First cause, whose word spoke Light into existence, when he examines into the mathematical conditions required for the formation of colors. In every inch of red light there are

forty thousand waves, and in the whole length of the red ray four hundred and eighty millions of millions of waves; and as this ray enters the eye in one second, and the retina pulsates once for each of these waves, we arrive at the astonishing conclusion, that when we behold a red object the membrane of the eye trembles at the rate of *four hundred and eighty millions of millions of times* between every two ticks of a common clock. Of yellow light five hundred and thirty-five millions of millions of waves enter the eye, and beat against the nerve of vision in the sixtieth part of a minute." These are the miracles which every second witnesses, and which show that Creation is a continuous process, dating from the beginning, but continuing with unerring accuracy to the end of Time. The difference between the rapidity of the movements of the different colors would lead us to believe, that there must be some difference also in the heating effects produced by them on the eye, as we know that increased mechanical action always produces increase of heat in matter, however attenuated and apparently intangible this may seem to our senses. Hence we understand the truth of the popular notion, which considers "blue a very soft, cool, *retiring* color; that green is cool, though less so than blue, yellow is warmer and *advancing*, orange still warmer, and red *fiery, harsh and exciting*."

But Domestic Science opens up still greater marvels when we consider the physical conditions of organic growth. One of these is the necessity of sun light for the development of woody tissue in the plant. The bright glimmer of the sun's rays conceals a chemic power which evolves solid substances out of the carbonic acid that the leaves of plants have absorbed from the atmosphere. This miraculous power results in the formation of wood, destined to be consumed for the production of heat that enables man to withstand the inclemencies of winter's cheerless cold; or perhaps, as geologists tell us, has occurred centuries and centuries ago, this same wood shall be metamorphosed into coal, that man's ingenuity will convert not only into fuel for diffusing warmth around the fire-side, but also into a gaseous sub-

stance that shall diffuse an artificial light when the rays of the same sun no longer light up our dwellings. The benefits of the sun light that gently brings forth the little plant from its seed, do not thus end with the formation of its woody tissue, but in other days, distant and remote from those in which its rays first lighted up the face of nature, aid in the production of artificial day. Who could conceive of the influence of one beam of sun light, thus vibrating influences of the most genial and heart-cheering character, through thousands of years, or rather through periods of time beyond the reach of our calculation?

Do we look at the atmosphere and its uses,—the same two-fold consequences must result from its reverential contemplation,—we are enabled the better to understand the physical necessity which requires that animals should be supplied with pure air, and that our dwellings should be adequately ventilated; and our impressions of the wondrous Wisdom that created the atmosphere and established its laws, are, at the same time, made deeper and more lasting. “The whole architecture and physiology of trees, shrubs and plants, are conformed to atmospheric nutrition, so that in literal truth the forests are but embodied and solidified air, * * * * active life, the vital union of body and spirit, and all the powers and susceptibilities of our earthly being are only maintained by the action of air in our systems. There is an awful life-import in these never-ceasing rhythmic movements of inspiration and expiration, this tidal flux and reflux of the gaseous ocean through animal mechanism. Shall we question that it is for an exalted purpose? Science has many things to say of the relations of air to life, but it can add nothing to the simple grandeur of the primeval statement, that the Creator breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.” Thus speaks Youmans, in the introduction to his article on the properties and composition of the atmosphere, and we have quoted the extract to show that the reverence of the writer keeps him from materialism, even when dwelling upon the material benefits that result from a natural

agent. We like him much better here, than when led away by his respect for one of our most prominent Chemists—Draper—he quotes the idea that we possess the wonderful “capacity of comprehending *all* the conditions of our life,” and that there is nothing in the structure and functions of the body that we shall not at last explain. This language is, in our opinion, capable of being contorted into meaning considerably more than the general spirit of our author would seem to show as his own views of human knowledge. We have no right to assume that, in any particular object of study, we have gained, or are likely to gain, sufficient knowledge to imply an exhaustion of the subject, or that indeed we have done more than Newton thought he had effected—gathered some few little pebbles which the great ocean of knowledge—wide and illimitable so far as human measure is concerned—had dashed, with its inflowing tides, on the beach before us. There never can be an Alexander in science, whose tears, prompted by an unsatiated ambition, shall flow because the whole world has been conquered, and nothing more remains to be acquired. This is true, not only as regards Science in general, but of every particular department. It is the solace of the student, as he pores over other men’s labors and makes their discoveries his own. He does not despair because their gleanings may have been great; that therefore the field will no longer yield a reward for his own toil. There is an inward assurance that the laborer here always will have a reward.

The direct relations of man to the atmosphere are principally established by means of the lungs. In these organs a system of exchanges is ever taking place during life. The material which is no longer available for the animal is exchanged for that which his system requires. How few are at all cognizant of the great necessity that this exchange should be carried on so that each inspiration shall be not only supplied with the gas that stimulates to action, but be devoid of any deleterious particles. The six hundred millions of cells of the lungs, forming an area of about one

hundred and sixty square yards of thin cell wall, must be supplied with sufficient oxygen to feed the microscopic blood vessels that inosculate around them, and must not contain any poisonous material to contaminate the life current of blood. On the perfection with which this process of respiration is carried on depends the maintenance of animal life and the production of the very substance that constitutes the essential food of the leaves of plants.

But the artificial tastes derived from luxury make certain artificial odors when used, specially delightful to our organs of smell. Such scents are derived both from the vegetable and the animal kingdoms. Johnston discourses pleasantly, as is his custom in all his writings, on the principal of these, from the costly attar of roses, produced in the rose-gardens of Ghazepore, down to the oil of peppermint of our country, and, indeed on all "the odors which we enjoy." These are of varying grades commercially—some costing as much as £10 sterling per rupee, (about 176 grains) and others of very small value. The volatile oils are mingled together so as to produce new odors, such as singly are not met with in nature; and we find that this commingling is like that which the composer employs to produce harmony. We can only employ certain notes to produce a perfect accordant tone in music,—and the perfumer finds that some odors will "blend easily and naturally with each other, producing a harmonious impression, as it were, on the sense of smell. By the skilful admixture, in kind and quantity, of odors producing a similar impression, the most delicate and unchangeable fragrances are manufactured. * * When they are not mixed upon this principle, perfumes are often spoken of as becoming *sickly* or *faint*, after they have been a short time in use." How delicate must be the organ which can so infallibly judge of the combination of odors that in themselves are unlike and yet may produce either *harmony* or *discord* by their admixture. Are we not admitted, by a knowledge of these facts, into a closer view of the wonderful harmony that pervades all Creation? Science for domestic purposes

can thus administer to the aesthetic delights of man, and, while supplying his luxurious habits and desires with those odors that custom has made agreeable, can show that there is nothing arbitrary in their combination, but that this must be governed by unchanging laws. It is true that education and habit may make agreeable to one person what is intolerable to another, and the anecdote of the Spartan lady who visited Berenice with so much discomfort, because forsooth one was odoriferous with butter and the other with sweet ointment, which were by no means agreeable in either case to the party not using them, can be readily acknowledged, without any contradiction of the laws laid down on the subject. There are, however, certain odors, with regard to which mankind are united in asserting their dislike, and domestic science, while it teaches us that such may be masked or concealed by those which are more fragrant, yet if they naturally possess deleterious qualities, such concealment of their presence does not prevent their noxious action.

To prevent the collection of contaminating substances in the atmosphere, is the duty of every good citizen of our towns. It becomes his duty because the lives of his neighbors are endangered, as well as his own. A thorough knowledge of their origin and the modes of preventing and destroying them should constitute a portion of his education. He cannot live in the world and be so enwrapped in objects of study, as to become proof against the injurious effects of changes in the normal constitution of the physical conditions of health and life. He is entitled to pure air, and however absorbing his pursuits may be, it is of first importance that he should assert his claims to this blessing. Johnston suggests that the nauseous odors which abound in Cologne, may be "at once the parent and grand consumer of its artificial rivers of scented water." It will be recollected how Coleridge writes, that he

counted two-and-seventy stenchs,

All well defined and several stinks,

in the town of Cologne.

To destroy the contaminating materials, whatever they may be, in the air, is of far more importance than to disguise their presence. So long as the nose is informed of their presence, man is somewhat on his guard with reference to their probable injurious effects. The value of disinfection depends on such destruction of offensive and lethal odors, that they shall be absolutely removed *as such* from the atmosphere. Substances are furnished by chemistry that will ensure the required destruction without the formation of new compounds possessing any injurious tendency.

We hardly think it necessary to occupy any space by dwelling on the value of the knowledge mentioned in the last paragraph. The connection between the mind and body is so intimate that whatever materially impedes the action of one, also injures the other. The mere student will never feel his mind so bright under the depressing influences of impure air, as when he is inhaling the pure and balmy breezes which come across the verdant plain, or is occupying a chamber in whose construction the admission of pure air from without has been properly provided for. His mental acumen, power of perception and deduction will in the one case be far inferior to the other. Again; what man has the right homicidally to immolate his family upon the altar of his ignorance by suffering them to occupy rooms where they are forced to inhale air saturated with pestilential effluvia from stagnant pools, piles of putrescent animal or vegetable garbage, or unventilated cellars, where moisture and mould, reacting on each other, beget vile gaseous compounds? Do not the emaciated forms of his children, the haggard and anxious look of his wife,—the exsanguine, sickly countenances of his whole family—show him that a secret poison is working out the most pernicious results? Let but the epidemic disease present itself within the neighborhood of his family,—and their broken down constitutions invite its presence, furnishing material on which it can employ its most deadly powers. The history of all epidemics shows that, where filth and bad ventilation

are found, there they revel and death holds his court in the most hideous form. A wise Providence has furnished man with means of ameliorating many of the evils that surround him, and if he culpably neglects to acquire or use this knowledge, may not the deadly plague, in the mysterious workings of that same Providence, be sent to remind him of his duty? Carlyle has illustrated this in, we think, one of his Latter day pamphlets, by showing how a poor girl laboring under the first symptoms of a contagious disease, being thrust, in a most unnatural manner, from the door, where she had asked charity, might yet show that she was of the *same* human family with the unsympathizing rich, by lighting up in a neighborhood disease that would bring to the portals of eternity the fortunate and prosperous along with the despised and wretched.

Next to the requirements of the animal system for unlimited supplies of pure and unadulterated air, are those for nutriment obtained from the exterior world and prepared by the process of digestion for the upbuilding of tissues. Here, Domestic Science finds an ample field for the exercise of the highest order of talent in examining into the sources of the different alimentary substances, their frequent adulterations and their relative value in furnishing the body with its proper nutriment. While it may administer to the expensive tastes of the extravagant and preside over the table where Lucullus eats with Lucullus, claiming as its devotees many a follower who would proudly write himself *sus Epicuro grege*, yet its highest duties are not comprised in such labors. Proper nutriment is most important indeed for man. When suffering from a want of food,—his mind cannot be applied with any force to the investigation of an abstruse subject, no more than the full muscular vigor of his body can be brought into requisition for the accomplishment of a task requiring bodily strength. Each moment that he lives—some portion of his body dies,—and it dies in order that he may live. Life is made up of a continuous series of deaths of living particles,—their place supplied by others, that have received a temporary vitality

from the mysterious principle,—which in turn give way to others and thus we have a continuous series of deaths following each other from the first origin of the living being on to the end, when the death of the whole organic body occurs synchronously with the departure of its undying soul. Investigations into this mysterious series of changes cannot produce materialism with those students who have learned to look upon all Nature as the work of one Power.

But these changes, if they take place continually in the body and all through its various parts, must produce from time to time a collection of material particles that are absolutely different from the collections that made up the body at an antecedent period. The materials forming the structure must change and yet the personal identity of the body evidently remains unchanged,—the same, as it feebly crawls over the nursery floor, gaily trips along the road to school, contends with giant force on the battle field, or totters down the hill of life in extreme old age. What is the extent of these changes? How do they affect personal identity? These questions may be examined from the stand-point of Domestic Science.

What is the extent of the changes that every instant produces in the structure of the human body? We shall employ in the answer to this question the facts that Youmans and Johnston have collected. The medium for the conveyance of nutrient material to the system is the blood, and the same liquid current acts as the scavenger for the removal of effete substances. This passes through the lungs, in portions, with each pulsation of the heart, that is, once in a second, and the whole quantity (taking the body as of the weight of 140 lbs.), from twenty to thirty pounds, is forced through the lungs about twenty times in an hour. But when slight exertion is made the rapidity of the movement is much accelerated, and at times the whole amount may be forced through the lungs in half a minute. It seems not at all unreasonable to suppose, therefore, that this passage through the lungs of the whole amount of blood is

from six hundred to seven hundred times in a day, which would be equal to "a total movement through the heart" of from twelve thousand to fourteen thousand pounds of blood in twenty-four hours. Now there is lost by perspiration two and a half pounds of water, and there escapes in other directions about two and a quarter pounds of matter." This loss of four and three quarter pounds must be made up by the ingesta,—so that we have the substances composing the body necessarily undergoing a change in about thirty days. With each month the body is made up of different particles from those which constituted its totality the preceding month, or that will constitute it at the end of the thirty succeeding days. Here is change in the most startling form the mind can represent,—change that staggers credulity were the statement not based upon strict mathematical calculation,—change such as no man would credit unless he could be furnished the premises that lead to this astonishing conclusion. It will be understood that this change takes place in every portion of the body, in the solid bones, the reticulated structure of the cellular tissue, the fibrous muscles, the vessels through which the liquids continually flow, and in the very organ devoted to the purposes of thought itself. While we pen this article, and while our readers are reading its sentences, the brain structure, of both writer and reader, is undergoing destruction, decay and death, and is being renovated by new material from without through the mysterious power of vitality. Notwithstanding this change of constitution, yet we are not conscious of any impairment of the mental faculties. The train of thought is carried out to its legitimate end without any break or interruption. The mind is not suffering from this continuous series of destruction and reformation, no more than the exterior appearance of the body. In the adult the reparative and destructive processes go on *pari passu*, and even the test of weight shows very little difference at different portions of the day. In the earlier stages of existence, the formative process must be greater than the destructive, and of this fact we have proof in alteration

of form and weight. In those days when age shows that the race of life is nearly run, the opposite is the case, and the destructive process is more rapid than the other,—the antagonism of the two is not preserved in equilibrio, and even should disease not exercise its destroying effects on the wasting form, the inevitable tendency of the destructive process will be death.

In what consists personal identity if this unceasing change is taking place in the living body? We do not propose to consider this question affirmatively, but negatively, desiring to show that if the material constitution of the body is continually changing, *personal* identity must be something more than mere identity of *material* particles. Butler has shown that the reason why a vegetable growth, as a tree, is ordinarily recognized as the *same* from year to year, is not because it is composed of the same particles, during the course of many years, but because ordinarily we recognize the sameness as consisting in a continuation of the same life in the same organization, and yet this very explanation uses the word *same* in different senses, since its signification as an adjective prefixed to life and organization is different from that when applied to matter. He avoids a definition, and shows how, nevertheless, there can be no difficulty in getting at the idea, which arises from a comparison of ourselves at any two moments in existence. But we can do no more towards furnishing a definition than was done by the learned Bishop,—although our discoveries satisfy us that material particles have nothing to do with the idea of personal identity. The body is ever changing and yet it remains the same,—amenable to punishments by human law for its misdeeds, although not a material particle of the culprit shall exist when the punishment is inflicted,—entitled to rewards for certain acts of philanthropy or bravery, although not an atom of the material which constituted it when the brave or philanthropic deed was performed may be retained at the time when the reward is conferred.

Unless Science satisfied us of this continual change, we

should be forced to confine our definition of personal identity to material sameness. The idea would be gross and sensuous, and yet it would be the natural conclusion to which the uninformed would arrive, deprived of the aid of scientific research. We find, that with the aid of the latter, we are led to a higher and more exalted view of this subject, and a higher idea, also, of the body itself, as something requiring material particles for the performance of its functions on earth, but independent, in one sense, of these, since it is always changing, yet remaining itself the same. Youmans has employed some illustrations which will aptly show an analogy in the sphere of inanimate nature. "A waterfall is permanent, and may present the same aspect of identity and unchangeableness from generation to generation; but who does not know that it is certainly made up of particles in a state of swift transition; the cataract is only a *form* resulting from the definite course which the changing particles pursue. The flame of a lamp presents to us for a long time the same appearance; but its constancy of aspect is caused by a ceaseless change in the place and condition of the chemical atoms which carry on combustion." Now the body is not, as our author would claim, merely an unvarying *form*, unless we give to this word a definition, which will include both external shape and the entire essence. We are not able to define the idea of body, as in the case of personal identity, *in totidem verbis*, but we are forced to the conclusion that it must be in some way independent of material particles and yet confined to them during its career on earth. The *natural* body must indeed be something very different from that spiritual body, into which it shall be converted at the end of time. In restless activity must the body have its existence while tenanted by the spirit, and its material particles have no release from change until the fitful career of life is over. They proceed on their incessant round of duty and amid all changes, the identity of the person is unaffected.

It was the opinion of old commentators on the Creed,

that in order to recognize in full force the meaning of the article relating to the Resurrection of the body, we must believe in the Resurrection of the material particles. Pearson, in his Exposition of the Creed, dwells upon the necessity that "the same flesh which was separated from the Soul at the day of death, should be united to the Soul at the last day." He quotes the passage from Job, "Though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my *flesh* shall I see God." Ursinus* says also on this subject, "The bodies which shall rise, shall be not only humane bodies, but even the self same also which we now in our life-time carry about with us. * * If then the bodies which have sinned shall receive accordingly, not other bodies but the same shall rise. * * * The justice of God requireth that the flesh of the saints which have fought the field should also be crowned; and the flesh of the wicked, which hath blasphemed against God should be tormented." If either of these learned divines meant that the identical *material* particles with which the body was clothed at the period of death, should invest it at the period of the Resurrection, the facts of Domestic Science must show that they were led to fallacious conclusions. Our knowledge of the laws of matter,—and it is about matter they are reasoning—show us the thing is impossible unless an entire subversion of these laws should be produced, and a miracle of most astounding nature be exhibited. "The matter which forms our body, when we are laid in the grave, and which, after a brief residence there, makes its way, through some nutritive plant, into the body of another man, and forms part of his body still when *he* is buried—this matter which is neither his nor mine, has already been "slave to thousands," and may be buried with ten thousand bodies more, before the resurrection comes,"†—must we believe that a miracle shall be performed so that it shall form the material of these ten thousand bodies at the last great day, in order to

* The Summe of Christian Religion, delivered by Zacharias Ursinus. Translated into English by Dr. Henrie Parry. Oxford. 1601.

† Johnston's Chem. of Com. Life. II. 443.

show our credence in this important article of our faith? Does the idea of sameness *require* such an explanation, in order that it shall exist uninjured by materialistic views? The analogy which arises from the contemplation of the body in its earthly career, ever changing its material clothing and yet retaining its identity, must apply here to the resurrection. The self-same bodies shall rise—they can be flesh, to use the language of Job, they can be natural bodies raised into the condition of spiritual bodies, they can be constituted of flesh and blood, but it must be in a glorified condition, as corruption cannot inherit incorruption,—all this may be and will be, but we are obliged to deny that the self-same material particles will constitute the resurrected body.

The argument arising from the idea that “the *flesh* of the saints that have fought the field,” and that of “the wicked which hath blasphemed against God,” should be respectively crowned and tormented, cannot hold in favor of the resurrection of the *same material particles*, because the latter have ever been changing. Twelve times in a year have the bodies been reconstructed, their flesh been formed of new and foreign particles. But yet these bodies have remained the same, and will in their *identical* substance, whatever it may be, (and we believe the answer to this is beyond human intelligence) receive their reward,—will put on immortality at the will of the great Creator.

These conclusions, springing necessarily from the facts and laws of Domestic Science, are stated with a firm and decided recognition of the truths of Revelation, and the binding force of the Apostles' Creed, and, furthermore, with the belief that they give us a higher and more wonderful appreciation of the idea of the Resurrection, by exhibiting its perfect accordance with the analogy of what is taking place daily in the human body. Wherever Science seems to contradict Revelation, we should labor to find the cause of the contradiction. It will show itself in our inability to read the two aright. But when both are read aright, then the former will lend its feeble light to increase the splendor

of the glorious truths which the latter has stored up for man. Our conclusions here seem to us really not of a conflicting character with the quotations from Ambrose and Augustine which Ursinus employs,—nor indeed with the whole article of the latter, entitled—"What bodies shall rise."

Baltimore, Md.

L. H. S.

ART. VII.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE NORSE-FOLK; or a Visit to the Homes of Norway and Sweden. By *Charles Loring Brace*. New York: Charles Scribner. 1857.

A peculiar interest still attaches to old Norway, the original home of the Norman, who, together with the Saxon, constitutes the bone and sinew of the Anglo-American race. It is a strange, wild, mountainous country with its midsummer night's sun and long winter darkness, its great bosses of snow-fields, its lake-like fjords, its steep promontories, its endless pine forests, and that jagged, furrowed coast-line which stretches above a thousand miles from the regions of eternal ice down to a genial latitude of wheat lands and flowers. It is the brow of the earth, the forehead of Europe, as the Scalds loved to call it in their songs. Add to this the hardy peasantry, the shepherd's life in the Saeters, the wandering nomade Laps and their encampments, the bear hunts, the poetical legends and romantic superstitions coming down from the times of the Edda and still lingering in the secluded valleys, and finally the Protestant religion of the people just now awaking from the sleep of indifference and rationalism and beginning to throb with warm life-blood. We still remember with what intense interest and delight we read, when a student, the stirring descriptions of Scandinavian life and scenery in Steffen's *Malcolm*, and the *Four Norwegians*.

The Rev. Mr. Brace, of New York, gives us in this book the impressions of a recent trip to Scandinavia, especially to Norway and Sweden. The first we read of his pen was a series of letters he wrote six or seven years ago from Berlin, Prague, and Vienna, for the columns of the "*Independent*." We liked them for their freshness, candor, impartiality of spirit, and the desire to get at the "history of fire-sides," as Daniel Webster

called it, or at the "home-life" of Germany. We thought them much superior to most of the newspaper correspondence of American travellers in Europe, who very often retail only the outside information contained in the common hand books of tourists.

The present volume partakes of the same characteristics. The author shows a considerable talent of observation, freedom from prejudice, and succeeds well, as every book of travels should do, in combining instruction with entertainment. The first sixteen chapters relating to Norway we like best. As to Denmark, he gives us only an outline sketch of Copenhagen, with some esthetic remarks on the works of the celebrated sculptor, Thorwaldsen.

On Sweden Mr. Brace dwells more at length, but gives rather an unfavorable view of the present moral and religious condition of the Lutheran Church in that country. He derives its evils mainly from the close connection with the State. He thinks that this union will probably be dissolved before the close of this century, and that the Baptists and Methodists, "who have thus far suffered persecution, banishment and reproach, and yet gain each day a stronger hold on the hearts of the people," will hasten this end. "The Swedish nature," he says, "is one that cannot rest content with mere skepticism or with rationalism unlighted by religion. It is inclined to religious faith and consolation. . . . The present clergy will become to the peasants as did the hierarchy of England to the Puritans of the Revolution. They will abhor and renounce them; and when the change comes, one of the great things done will be the utter sweeping away of the House of Clergy and all political powers belonging thereto. The Church will be left to rest where it should, on the personal relations of pastor and people, on the affection of the one, and the abilities and self-sacrifice and piety of the other."

It is very natural that an American of the Puritan order should entertain such views and hopes. But all men are not alike, and Sweden has a different destination from that of New England, nor is it impossible that it may attain to a better state of religion by gradual reforms without passing through a violent revolution. It is a significant sign that the present King openly favors the principle of religious liberty, and his counsels may yet prevail over the strong prejudices of the clergy, the nobility and the peasantry.

P. S.

THE POOR BOY AND MERCHANT PRINCE; or Elements of Success
drawn from the Life and Character of the late *Amos Lawrence*.
By *William M. Thayer*. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1857.

A very useful little volume for young men who want to get rich by fair means, and for old and young men who are rich.

It is no disgrace to be poor. Christ was poor, the apostles, the early martyrs, the missionaries, the reformers and the majority of the great men and benefactors of the race were poor, or at least in moderate circumstances. So on the other hand, it is no honor to be rich. Neither money, nor dress, nor profession, but character makes the man. A rich miser is of no more use to society than a mail bag or an old iron chest in some corner of the garret. But while the mere possession of wealth can add nothing to a man's real value or happiness, and may even materially diminish or destroy both, the *right use* of wealth is a virtue and a source of enjoyment. This constitutes the morale of the above book in the form of a living example that speaks louder than words.

The late Amos Lawrence, of Boston, rose by good sense, industry and perseverance from poverty to a princely fortune. For all that he might have lived and died without a true friend, without sympathy and without fame. But with the art of getting rich he learned the more important art of doing good, which is the first and last object of life. As he prospered in business and grew in wealth, he remembered the poor and grew in liberality to churches, schools and colleges. The more he gave away, the richer he became in turn, thus proving the old proverb: "Charity gives itself rich; covetousness hoards itself poor." He contributed about seven hundred thousand dollars to various benevolent objects, not with the stiffened hand of bequest, but with the living palm and with the full sympathies and affections of a husband and father. This is it that gave him a national reputation, collected crowds of mourning friends, widows and orphans around his grave, and reared a monument to his name more enduring than marble or gold. He was economical, in order that he might practice benevolence. He followed the excellent rule of Wesley: "Make all you can; save all you can; give all you can." To give, was to him the greatest luxury. He knew from experience, that "it is more blessed to give than to receive."

He brought his children up to the same virtue. "I hope," he wrote to his son, "you will have one day the delightful conscience of using a portion of your means in a way to give you as much pleasure as I have experienced. Your wants may be brought within a very moderate compass; and I hope you will never feel yourself at liberty to waste on yourself such means, as, by system and right principles, may be beneficially applied to the good of those around you. Our first duty is to those of our own household, then extending to kindred, friends, neighbors (and the term neighbors may, in its broadest sense, take in the whole human family), citizens of our State, then of our country, then of other countries of the world." In another letter, quoting from some writer, he says: "The good there is

in riches lieth altogether in their use, like the woman's box of ointment; if it be not broken and the contents poured out for the refreshment of Jesus Christ, in his distressed members, they lose their worth; the covetous man may, therefore, truly write upon his rusting heaps: These are good for nothing. He is not rich who *lays up* much, but he who *lays out* much; for it is all one not to have, as not to use. I will, therefore, be the richer by charitably laying out, while the worldling will be poorer by his covetous hoarding up."

Such a man deserves to be held up, as is done in this book, as an example for the young men of our country. Few have as much to give away, as Amos Lawrence. But every one can, in proportion to his means, however limited, practice the same virtue, realize the same pleasure during his life, and reap the same reward after his death, in the gratitude of posterity and at the judgment seat of Him who noticed the widow's mite and promised to remember even a cup of cold water given to the least of his disciples in the time of need.

P. S.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF PHILOSOPHY. With an Outline Treatise on *Logic*. By the Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D. D., President of Franklin and Marshall College. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1858.

This book falls in with what has been styled—right or wrong—the Mercersburg movement, and is a legitimate application of it to metaphysical speculation. The Mercersburg system aims at a philosophical theology and a Christian philosophy, that has for its vital principle Jesus Christ, as the highest revelation of both God and man, and is based upon the historical life of the Church as Christ's body and the organ of his presence in the world. About one half of Dr. Gerhart's volume is a free and somewhat amplified translation of Beck's *Logic*, and is admirably suited for a text-book. The other half is an original introduction to the study of philosophy in general. Its object is to show the necessary inward connection of true philosophy with the revelation of God in Christ, as the author of that religion which is not simply one among other religions, but the absolute and universal religion, answering to, and satisfying, the deepest moral and intellectual wants of the race and reconciling the whole man, his reason and will, to God. This object Dr. Gerhart has carried out within the small limits allowed him, in a clear and vigorous manner that must command the respectful attention of earnest thinkers, and will increase confidence in him as a sound and safe teacher of Christian philosophy in the important literary institution over which Providence has placed him.

P. S.

HISTORY AND LIFE OF THE REV. DOCTOR JOHN TAULER, of Strassbourg; with twenty-five of his Sermons. Translated from the German by Susanna Winkworth; and a Preface by the Rev. Charles Kingsley. With an Introduction by the Rev. Roswell D. Hitchcock, D. D., Washburn Prof. of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, N. Y. New York: Wily & Halsted. 1850.

A mediaeval book in mediaeval style; the glory of the hidden life of God revealing itself in a monastic cell; mystic twilight from the dark ages announcing the morning of the Reformation; the spirit of freedom struggling for deliverance from legal bondage; a voice crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way to the Lord. A most interesting and charming book, not for the many, but for the appreciating few, whose number is increasing every day, who delight in seeking and adoring the Saviour in all ages of the Church to which he has pledged his unbroken presence; in all forms of piety, in which his holy and blessed image is reflected as the light in so many colors; in the humblest followers in whom he has condescended to dwell. "The more traces we find of our Master's image in any, and in all, of the Christian centuries, the better will it be, at once for ourselves, and for the cause we serve."

"Mysticism," says our friend, the American editor of this beautiful volume, "mysticism has become in our day a term of indiscriminate and undeserved reproach. If we mean by it that enthusiastic reverence for the inner light, which, as in Quakerism, overrides the authority of Scripture, and repudiates the ordinances and sacraments of the Church, then we do well to denounce it, and the more vigorously the better. But if, in a wider latitude of usage, we mean by it only a special prominence and emphasis of the Johannean type of Christian life and doctrine, then, surely, we ought not to denounce, and had better not be very jealous of it. This introverted, brooding, meditative sort of piety has indeed its special perils. Exaggeration and excesses in this direction are extremely easy; the intense inward experience of divine things being peculiarly liable to divorce itself from established formulas of doctrine, from the ordinary means of grace, and from outward duty. But the germ and roots of this development are undoubtedly in the Scriptures. Not the Platonic John alone, who has been hailed as the spiritual father of the mystics, but the Aristotelian Paul also, discourses fervently of this hidden life of the Spirit, setting forth Christ as so formed within us, that the man himself expires. "I am crucified," he says, "with Christ. Nevertheless, I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." While our Lord himself has declared that the kingdom of God is within us."

Tauler (died 1361) was one of the humblest and most pious

of monks, one of the deepest and most practical of mystics, one of the most earnest and impressive of preachers, and altogether one of the most remarkable men in that middle period which connects our modern Christianity and civilization with that of the ancient Church. The imitation of the lowly life of Jesus was his ruling thought and passion. His Sermons resemble much in spirit that inimitable Imitation of Christ by Thomas a Kempis, and deserve a place beside it. They exerted much influence upon the training of Luther from monastic asceticism to evangelical freedom and thus helped to prepare the way for the Reformation. The history of his life, and especially his interesting connection with a mysterious layman, Nicolas of Basle, one of the "Friends of God," has recently been more fully brought to light by Prof. Schmidt of Strassbourg.

It was a happy idea of Miss Susanna Winkworth, an English lady of the highest cultivation and refined taste, whose agreeable acquaintance we made some years ago in the hospitable house of her particular friend, the Chevalier Dr. Bunsen, to present to the English public a translation of the select sermons of Tauler, with an account of his life and labors. For this task she was admirably qualified by her mastery of the German language and her previous translation of the "Theologia Germanica," one of the most remarkable productions of mediæval mysticism, and of German hymns.

Prof. Hitchcock now introduces this work to the American reader, in a style almost as elegant as the English edition, though offered at one-third the price, and reflecting credit upon American enterprise and taste. He has enriched it with a lucid historical introduction, which, in connection with his Inaugural Address, and an able essay on Development, gives him at once an honorable place among the rising American Church historians, who, by combining English and German learning and mode of thought, are destined to fill a new page in the historiography of Christianity.

P. S.

GNOMON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, by John Albert Bengel. Vol. I. Matthew and Mark. Translated by the Rev. James Bandinel and Rev. Andrew Fausset. Vol. III. Romans and 1 Corinthians. Translated by the Rev. James Bryce. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1857.

COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF KINGS. By Karl Friedrich Keil. Translated by James Murphy. Supplemented by *Commentary on the Books of Chronicles*. By Ernst Bertheau. Translated by James Martin. 2 Vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1857.

One German book after another finds its way in an English

dress to Great Britain and the United States. So rapid has been the increase of this kind of literature within the last ten years that we will soon have a complete Anglo-German library on Exegesis and Church History, circulating more widely than in the land of their birth. Whatever our theological "Know-nothings" may say and do, it is altogether too late at this hour of the day to stop the importation of Teutonic learning and thought either in Scotland, or in England, or in this country. It is becoming more and more bone of our bones and flesh of our flesh and will make itself increasingly felt at every successive stage of English and American theology.

We are especially pleased to see *Bengel's Gnomon* included in Clark's valuable series of continental theology. This book has long since been in its Latin dress a standard work among critical students of the New Testament. Since its first appearance exegesis has indeed made great progress. But, like all truly classical productions, it can never be superseded. In profound reverence for the Word of the living God, in critical sagacity, felicitous brevity, terse condensation, and suggestive pregnancy, Bengel still stands out "*facile princeps*" among older and modern commentators. John Wesley believed him "the most pious, the most judicious, and the most laborious" of all the modern expounders of the New Testament, and made large use of him in his own Notes. His brevity is indeed sometimes enigmatic, and it may be said of him: "*Brevis esse laborans, obscurus fit.*" But it is equally true what, I believe, the late archdeacon Hare remarked of his *Gnomon*, that it often condenses more matter into one line than can be extracted from many pages of other writers. His exegetical principle: "*Totum te applica ad textum; textum totum applica ad te,*" is a most excellent one, and was carried out by him with the most conscientious fidelity. His notes are at once edifying and instructive and introduce into the very marrow of the Bible which he called "the greatest of all the gifts of God."

The translation, as far as we can judge from a hasty comparison with the original Latin, seems to have been executed with great care and accuracy, indeed more so than many of the Edinburgh translations of German works are said to be. Three more volumes will complete this first English edition of Bengel's *Gnomon*.

The above works, and all the other volumes constituting Clark's "Foreign Theological Library," can be had at the cheap bookstore of Messrs. Smith & English, Sixth St., Philadelphia.

P. S.

A LITURGY: OR ORDER OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP. Prepared and published by the direction and for the use of the German Reformed Church in the United States of America. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1858. Price \$1.00.

The Publishers introduce this long looked for liturgy with the following notice:

"The work herewith offered to the Christian public is designed as a directory and help to public and private worship; and is the result of several years' earnest and prayerful labor. This labor, however, was not devoted to the composition of original forms, so much as to the digesting and reproduction of evangelical forms and services already at hand, both ancient and modern, with such modifications in the mode of expression and other minor details, as a change of time and of circumstance, seemed, to a conservative judgment, to demand. Whilst the book, therefore, it is believed, will be found redolent of the sweetest liturgical devotions of earlier times, it will also be found savory of the freshness of an original production. The spirit which predominated in its preparation, was that of filial regard for everything good and true in past ages, joined to the spirit of genuine Christian liberty. But in all cases in which older forms are used, the original Greek or Latin sources were consulted and followed.

"As stated in the advertisement, this Liturgy has been prepared with primary reference to the Reformed Church in this country. At the same time, a mere glance at its contents will show that the book is wholly free from anything strictly denominational. Even the name of the Church under whose auspices it is published, occurs only on the title-page and in the advertisement; no other denominational allusions are found except in the few forms in which the doctrinal standard of the Reformed Church, the Heidelberg Catechism, had to be named. In this view, therefore, the new Liturgy commends itself to general favor and use. Any Christian clergyman, not hostile to all such forms, will find it offering to his hand helps of which he may most profitably avail himself. And in Christian families it is calculated to serve as a book of social and private devotion, suited to all the ordinary seasons and services of the Christian year."

Room forbids us to add any thing at this time. But for the April number we hope to furnish a history and analysis of the new German Reformed Liturgy which is likely to be received with a considerable degree of interest beyond the limits of the denomination for whose provisional use it was more immediately prepared. We are happy to learn that the first edition of a thousand copies was already sold (mostly to outsiders, it seems) within three weeks after its issue from the press.

THE PRINCIPLE OF VIRTUE, AND VIRTUE OF PRINCIPLE: An Address delivered at the dedication of the New Hall of the Di-
 agnothian Literary Society, Lancaster, Pa., July 28th, 1857,
 by Rev. George B. Russell, A. M.

Opening with an appropriate and beautiful introduction, the author proceeds to discuss the Principle of Virtue, and the Virtue of Principle, the subject being suggested by the motto of the Society: *Εξελος ριπνοστας αρεσας αρεσας*. The Principle of Virtue is that in which virtue, or a morally right life, consists; and the Virtue of Principle is the strength and firmness of such a morally right life. Of the one he says very correctly, that "its first embodiment is found in the person of Him who was the Truth, uniting in one the two factors of which we have spoken, the fixed and the variable, the absolute and the finite, the Divine and the human in the God-man. So far as these are brought into subjective activity, realizing the harmony of law and freedom in the personality of any man, is he truly virtuous. Virtue is then that quality of the soul which exercises its activities freely and yet withstands the soliciting power of temptation to transgress law, under whatever form it may confront the human will through the avenues of the appetites, desires and senses." A lucid and definite statement of the truth of all ethical truth.

The Virtue of Principle he finds "in the rewards and punishments of the law controlling and conditioning man's conduct." "From this general ground springs the power of the principle that disposes to Virtue." We would rather say that the power of the Principle is in the Principle; that the *virtue* of Virtue is in virtue itself; just as we would affirm the power or virtue of a germ to be, not in its conditions nor yet in the good or bad fruit of the developed tree, but in the nature of the germ itself; that is to say, the *virtue* of Principle is in the true ground of personality with which the man, when right, is in living communion and harmony, and therefore in harmony also with all the relations of his being, and able to be active according to the law of God in opposition to the soliciting power to transgress law. Rewards are the necessary state and consequences of virtue in principle and action, and belong to the wholeness of a virtuous man's life. As a part of the wholeness of a virtuous life, they react directly on the whole man, and serve thus to strengthen the power or virtue of Principle; just as the normal activity of any organ of the body, whilst deriving this activity from the principle of natural life, reacts upon and increases the vigor of the general life itself.

The Address is philosophical yet practical; rich in thought and compact, yet not obscure; suggestive, yet a full discussion; logical in arrangement, yet free and easy in its style; and merits, therefore, not only a cursory reading, but careful study.

E. V. G.

HINTS FOR RELIEF, By a General Law to Protect and Promote Amicable Arrangements for Extension and Compromise betwixt Debtor and Creditor. By Charles M. Ellis. Boston : Crosby, Nichols & Co. 1857.

Assuming that Congress, under the article of the Federal Constitution which authorizes it "to establish uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States," has full power to enact a permanent national system, by which settlements betwixt debtors and creditors throughout the States and Territories might be legalized and facilitated; the author proceeds to show the many evils arising from the operation of the defective and conflicting laws on insolvency as at present existing in the different States, and then argues in favor of a general law or system, "whereby insolvent persons might be facilitated, in effecting full, cheap and instant settlements with their creditors, in such form as to secure the best interests of themselves and their creditors, and the equitable and speedy division of the estates and the just release of those debtors who might be unable so to arrange, with efficient checks to fraud and waste." Thus he would lessen, and often cure, two of the greatest evils attending times of great commercial depression, namely, the necessity of temporary or permanent stoppage of business, and extended and protracted litigation.

The Tract is conceived in the spirit of humanity, prosecutes the argument under the direction of a sound judgment, and evinces a familiar acquaintance with the history of legislation on this subject in England and America; though it is somewhat deficient in logical arrangement, and therefore somewhat also in perspicuity and force.

E. V. G.

AN ADDRESS at the Dedication of the Second Hall of the Goethean Literary Society of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., July 28, 1857, by Lewis H. Steiner, A. M., M. D.

That was indeed a joyous day—a day long to be remembered—when the College from her own lofty abode could look down, like a queen, upon the beautiful palaces, reared on either hand by her twin daughters, who are equally near and equally dear, and behold her sons come thronging from afar to witness the solemnity of their dedication. The Hall on the south side, which bears the great name of Goethe, had chosen for her orator on that occasion one of her own distinguished sons, and well did he fulfill his task. The address lies before us. It breathes the ancient spirit and exhibits the ripened fruits of former training. It sets forth with admirable skill the high claims of literature, philosophy and science, but makes them all, as of

right they should, culminate in the religion of Jesus Christ, as the absolute truth. Science in particular is defended from the attacks of her enemies and the reproaches of her lukewarm friends. Those who regard her teachings as hostile to the Christian revelation are met and answered, and it is clearly shown, that if sceptics and infidels do wrest them from their true and proper meaning and use them as weapons wherewith to assail the Ark of the Covenant, they cannot be overcome by blind denunciation, but by disarming them and turning these same weapons against themselves, by showing that the book of nature and the book of God, instead of standing in flat contradiction, are really in full harmony with each other. Utterances like these are greatly needed at the present time, and we are glad, therefore, to hear one voice more in favor of the only ground, which can be taken with safety, and maintained against the enemies of the truth. *Philosophia obiter libata abducit a Deo, penitus hausta reducit ad eundem.*

P.

DARKNESS IN THE FLOWERY LAND; or Religious Notions and Popular Superstitions in North China. By the Rev. M. Simpson Culbertson, of the Shanghai Mission of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church. New York: Charles Scribner, 377 and 379 Broadway. 1857. pp. 235.

It has been our privilege to peruse several works on China; but never one, in which the same amount of information, in regard to the religious notions and popular superstitions of a particular section of that interesting country, was embraced in so small a compass, as in this volume. It contains many particulars, which are altogether new to us. The style is clean and forcible. "The sole object of the book is to promote the work of missions among the Chinese, by presenting such information as is calculated to awaken a deeper interest in their behalf, among those whose duty it is to send them the Gospel, which alone can deliver them from their present bondage, and from eternal death;" and in this object, we think, the writer has admirably succeeded.

F.